THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

FOURTH SERIES—VOL. III.—(XXXIII).—AUGUST, 1905.—NO. 2.

THE HISTORICAL AND THE DOGMATIC SENSE IN HOLY SCRIPTURE.

THE study of the relations between history and dogma which has been pursued with such ardor in modern times, has originated, or at any rate brought into more frequent use, the distinction between the historical and the dogmatic sense of Scripture. The distinction seems to have been introduced chiefly to meet the difficulties which arise from the interpretation of Scripture made by the Church. For the interpretation does not always give the sense which should apparently be given to a passage when examined by the rules of literary and historical criticism. I have no intention of denying the validity of the distinction, but I propose to make a few observations on it, with a view to clearing up certain confusions of thought which, as it seems to me, it sometimes conceals.

And first of all, for the sake of clearness, let us try to define what is meant by the Historical and the Dogmatic sense of Scripture.

To avoid the suspicion of proceeding by a merely *a priori* method, it will be advisable to take our definitions from the authors who make use of the terms, though we shall have to be satisfied with descriptions rather than definitions.

The dogmatic sense of Scripture, then, is the sense declared by the Church, that is, it is the doctrine which the Church sees to be affirmed in Holy Scripture, of which she declares this to be

the sense.[1] The historical sense is that which the sacred writer had in mind:[2] it is the primitive sense,[3] the original sense,[4] of the text.

So that the dogmatic sense is that which the Church affirms, while the historical sense is that which the sacred writer had in mind and expressed in writing.

Can these two senses be different; or must we say that they are identical?

We must premise with Fr. Bonaccorsi[5] that the Church does not necessarily affirm the sense of a text and make it dogmatic by using it in proof of some doctrine, or by quoting it in the definition of a Council; nor does the consent of the Fathers constitute a sufficient declaration of the sense to make it dogmatic, unless it has all those conditions which are required for tradition properly so-called.[6]

This being supposed, it is obvious that the historical and the dogmatic sense cannot contradict one another, for truth cannot contradict truth. There seems, however, no difficulty in admitting that they may be different, in the sense that one may be more clear than the other. Nobody denies that Catholic doctrine was not always so clearly defined as it is now. It has only by slow degrees reached its present state of clearer definition, as is evident from comparing the doctrine concerning the Blessed Trinity as it appears in the Gospels, with the same doctrine as contained in the Creeds and in the definitions of the Church. Certainly, it would be a grievous error to deny such degree in the clearness of doctrine, because Catholic doctrine is unchangeable.

Can the dogmatic sense be the consequent sense, that is, the

[1] "Egli sa molto bene che altro è il senso historico d'un passo biblico, altro n'è il senso dommatico che vien dichiarato dalla Chiesa. Non già che questo possa contraddire a quello; ma pur essendo connessi, son longi dall'essere identici tra loro."

"Nel testo di San Paolo ad Rom. v, 12, la Chiesa vede affermata la dottrina del peccato originale e dichiara che tale è il vero senso di quel passo." G. Bonaccorsi: *Questioni Bibliche;* pp. 196, 198.

[2] *Cf.* Bonaccorsi, *ibid.*, p. 199.

[3] *Cf.* Loisy, *Autour d'un petit livre*, p. 52.

[4] *Cf.* Loisy, *ibid.*, p. 54.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 195.

[6] *Cf.* Pesoli: *Praelectiones dogmaticae*, I, pp. 362–5.

sense which is not formally contained in the text of the Bible, but which is derived from it, as a conclusion is from its premises?

First of all to make what we understand by the consequent sense quite clear, we will quote a passage from Fr. Cornely: "We are naturally inclined on reading or listening to the words of another to reason and draw conclusions from what we read or hear, and to look upon these conclusions as the opinions of those whom we read or hear. But we can draw conclusions from the written or spoken words of another in two ways. For sometimes the words need only to be developed and explained, and forthwith a new and more fruitful idea is the result; sometimes we have to take another term, so that by syllogistic reasoning we may arrive at a new conclusion."[7]

In the former case we have without doubt the true Scriptural sense; but here we have to do with the consequent sense in the second signification. The sacred writers themselves have left us examples which show that in some sort of way this sense may be attributed to the Holy Spirit, and may be called the word of God,[8] and the Fathers have not infrequently argued in the same way. Nobody will deny that the Church, following their example, may lawfully use the consequent sense to prove dogma and to speak of it as the word of God. In this there is nothing that is not legitimate.

But it was not without reason that I said that the consequent sense was in some sort, though not strictly and in the proper sense of the term, the word of God, and so the sense of the Biblical text. Sometimes the following words of St. Augustine are quoted to prove the contrary: "The Spirit of God who spoke these words by the inspired writer also without doubt foresaw that this meaning would occur to the reader or hearer; nay, took care that it should occur to him, because it rests on the truth."[9] If this argument were valid, all the conclusions which can legitimately be drawn from Holy Scripture would be the word of God, and would have to be deemed inspired—a position which cannot be maintained.

[7] *Introductio generalis* (ed. mag), p. 527.
[8] *Cf.* Cornely, *ibid.*, p. 529.
[9] *De Doctrina Christiana*, III, 27 (Migne XXXIV, 80).

It seems to me that when the Church defines the sense of any text of the Bible—that is, when the object of the definition is not the doctrine contained in the text of Scripture, but the sense of the text itself—then the sense defined by the Church cannot be the consequent sense. The whole question, as is evident, depends on the intention of the Church, but the formula which the Church sometimes uses[10] seems clearly to show that she has in view, when she defines the meaning of a text, not the conclusion which can be drawn from it but the text itself. It is true that this is not said in so many words. That is not necessary. It is sufficient that the formula employed be clear enough to express and to make known to us the intention of the Church.

The dogmatic sense, then, must not be looked upon as a conclusion distinct, though legitimately deduced, from the Biblical sense, but as the proper and true Biblical sense itself. Can the dogmatic sense, so understood, be so distinct from the historical sense, yet not in contradiction to it, that each may be true, though each expresses a different truth?

If it is true, as I think and now suppose, that both the historical and the dogmatic sense are really and truly the Biblical sense, it would seem to follow that both express the same truth, but with different degrees of clearness. For the historical sense is nothing but those mental concepts which the sacred author made known to us in writing; and if the dogmatic sense is really and truly the Biblical sense, it too is nothing but the mental concepts which the sacred author made known to us in writing, and which serve to prove dogma. But, if both are made up of the same mental concepts, how can they express different truths?

It might perhaps be suggested that the historical sense is the mental concepts as they existed in the author's mind and were expressed by his words, while the dogmatic sense is those mental concepts together with others by which the primitive and original sense has been developed by tradition and by the definitions of the Church. This is precisely what I am maintaining; but I argue thus: what has been added by the Church is either some new truth or it is not. If it is, it certainly is not contained in the Biblical sense, nor can it be called the word of God, unless we

[10] *Cf.* Conc. Trid., Sess. XIV, Can. III.

suppose another inspiration besides that which was given to the sacred author, that is, unless we suppose that the addition was made by God's inspiration, in which case we should have two sacred and inspired authors instead of one. If, however, the addition is not a new truth, nothing remains but to say that it is the same truth expressed with greater clearness. Nor will it help our opponents much to make use of the trite comparison between the child and the man, where we have substantial identity yet at the same time a great difference. Comparisons are excellent means for illustrating an assertion, but not for proving it, and they should not be pressed too far. Then I freely allow that the dogmatic sense is contained in the historical sense in a rudimentary state, as is commonly said, and so there is often a considerable difference between them, but it is a difference only of less or greater clearness.

It is evident from what has been said how wrongly or, to use a milder word, how obscurely the dogmatic sense is opposed to the historical sense by the author of *Autour d'un petit livre:* "Le critique ne peut pas voir clairement dans le premier verset de la Genèse, que le monde a été tiré du néant, et le théologien, à propos de ce verset, doit l'affirmer. Le critique ne peut pas ne pas reconnaître, à la fin de l'Apocalipse, une annonce de la venue prochaine du Christ pour le jugement de tous les hommes, et le théologien doit interpréter, de manière ou d'autre, cette prophétie comme un symbole dont la portée dépasse le sens littéral. Si le théologien veut imposer ses explications au critique et l'obliger à les prendre comme sens original du texte, le critique ne pourra que se dérober aux injonctions du théologien, qui lui demande, inconscienment, de proclamer vrai ce qui, au point de vue de l'histoire, est faux, à savoir que le redacteur élohiste de la Genèse possédait nettement l'idée philosophique de la création absolue, et que l'auteur de l'Apocalipse ne croyait pas à la fin prochaine du monde."[11]

I honestly confess that I am not sure that I grasp the meaning of the author in this passage; I will try to interpret as best I can with the help of the context. And first of all by that double interpretation, the interpretation of the critic and the interpreta-

[11] P. 54.

tion of the theologian, he seems to designate that double sense which we have called the historical and the dogmatic. For he says :[12] "Autre est le travail du théologien et autre celui du critique. Le premier se fonde et se régle sur la foi. Le second, même quand il s'agit de la Bible, se fonde sur une expérience scientifique et se régle comme une recherche de science." Again,[13] "Le travail critique peut être coördonné par le croyant à l'interpretation dogmatique, et il doit l'être par celui qui enseigne au nom de l'Église."

Now he says that these two interpretations are not indeed contradictory,[14] but different and independent. "L'exégèse théologique et pastorale, et l'exégèse scientifique et historique sont donc deux choses très differentes, qui ne peuvent être reglée par une loi unique. Bien que la matière en paraisse identique, l'objet n'en est pas reéllement le même."[15] "On peut dire, sans paradoxe, que pas un chapitre de l'Ecriture, depuis le commencement de la Genèse jusqu' à la fin de l'Apocalipse, ne contient un enseignement tout à fait identique à celui de l'Eglise sur le même objet; consequemment, pas un seul chapitre n'a le même sens pour le critique et pour le théologien."[16] "Le travail critique . . . en tant qu'historique et critique, a en lui-même sa raison d'être, sa méthode, et il ne peut tenir que de lui-même les conclusions qui conviennent à sa nature propre."[17]

Moreover, according to this writer the historical and scientific interpretation expresses the primitive and original sense of Holy Scripture. "Quantité de gens étudient maintenant la Bible et la commentent sans intention de prouver quoi que ce soit, et à seule fin de déterminer la signification primitive et la portée originelle des textes."[18] "La loi de l'exégèse historique, qui est la détermination des faits et du sens primitif des textes . . ."[19]

The writer seems to say that this primitive sense of the text is the true Biblical sense, the sense which the sacred author expressed; but it is not so clear whether he also considers as such the sense which is obtained by dogmatic interpretation. "Le

[12] P. 50.
[13] P. 52.
[14] P. 52.
[15] P. 51.
[16] P. 54.
[17] P. 52.
[18] P. 50.
[19] P. 52.

théologien à propos de ce verset (le premier verset de la Genèse) doit l'affirmer (que le monde a été tiré du neant)." "Le théologien doit interpreter, de manière ou d'autre, cette prophetie (une annonce de la venue prochaine du Christ pour le jugement de tous les hommes) comme un symbole dont la portée dépasse le sens littéral." [20]

It is not clear what may be the meaning of "à propos de ce verset," and "un symbole dont la portée . . ." Does the writer wish to say that absolute creation affirmed by the theologian is really the meaning of the first verse of Genesis, although the critic cannot clearly perceive the meaning? In this case the object of the interpretation of the critic and of the theologian is not different, but one and the same, nor does the dogmatic sense differ from the historical, except in greater or less clearness. But if creation out of nothing is not contained in the first verse of Genesis, and the sacred writer did not give expression to such an idea, the theologian cannot and ought not to say that such is the Biblical sense. And if the writer merely wished to say that, while the theologian reads the first verse of Genesis and discusses the doctrine of creation, he ought to affirm creation out of nothing, without saying that such creation is contained in the first verse of Genesis, he says in a very elaborate way what nobody denies, so that I cannot believe that this is his meaning.

What has been said in no wise leads to the denial of the difference between the historical and the theological method in the interpretation of Scripture. For, as we have already seen, there are various sources from which we can gather the full sense of a passage, as there are different degrees of clearness with which any truth is propounded. Now the theologian who wishes to prove a dogma of the faith knows that he cannot always get the clearest proofs from the Bible. He will therefore have recourse to tradition and to the definitions of the Church to help out the Scripture proof. Why should he do this? He knows that tradition and the teaching of the Church are the best means for finding out what the true meaning of Scripture is.

Not everybody who studies Scripture, however, wants to prove dogma. "Il est possible, en effet, de regarder la Bible, non

[20] P. 54.

plus comme la règle ou plutôt la source permanente de la foi, mais comme un document historique où l'on peut decouvrir les origines et le développement ancien de la religion, un témoignage qui permet de saisir l'état de la croyance à telle époque, qui la présente dans des écrits de telle date et de tel charactère." [21]

One who has this end in view will not look for light elsewhere than in Holy Writ itself, and in those other sources of knowledge which, according to the rules of criticism, throw light on the conditions in which the Bible was written. Such a student will not perhaps be able to obtain by his method the full Biblical sense of a passage; but who would deny that he is for all that at liberty to use it?[22]

There is another point in which theologians seem at times to have gone astray. From the fact that there is one and the same author of all the books of Scripture, namely God Himself, it would seem to follow that we may take passages from any and all the books of Scripture for the purpose of mutual illustration.[23] This rule is true, provided it be rightly understood, but it must be confessed that it is not infrequently applied contrary to all the dictates of sound criticism.

It is certain that the word of God cannot contradict itself, but it does not thence follow that God proposes the same truths about the same subjects in different places of Holy Scripture. So that it would be wrong to suppose that to find out the sense of a certain passage, all other texts that bear on the same matter should be collated from all the different books of Scripture. One who seeks to know the full doctrine contained in Scripture on any given subject, will follow this method; not so he who proposes to find out the true sense of what is said about it in some particular place of Scripture; nor may we defend as certain the doubtful enunciation of some truth, because the same truth is beyond doubt propounded in another place. Could not God declare the same truth in different places—at one time in an obscure and dubious way, and at another with certainty? God knows all things with absolute certainty; but the question is, not precisely what was in the mind of God, but what He wished to express in such or

[21] Loisy, *Autour d'un petit livre*, p. 50.
[22] *Cf.* Lagrange, *La methode histor.*, p. 45.
[23] *Cf.* Cornely, *Introductio generalis*, p. 566.

such a passage of Scripture. Thus the dogma of retribution in a future life, which we profess and believe, is well illustrated and proved from the Book of Job, as well as from the Book of Wisdom; but, if someone asserted that there is only mention in the Book of Job of temporal reward, he could hardly be refuted by showing that in the Book of Wisdom there is certainly mention of retribution in a future life. Thus two books are two lamps which throw light on the same object, but the rays that come from one lamp cannot be attributed to the other.

Let this much be said to show that we by no means deny that various methods may be followed in the study of Holy Scripture. On the contrary, this is precisely what we contend for; since the scope of the theologian is often different from that of the critic, his method in keeping with his scope will frequently differ as well.

It may be that this is Loisy's meaning in the passages which I have just quoted. Candidly I do not know. It should be said that, if this is his meaning, he has expressed it very badly and it cannot be reconciled with many of his expressions. In the first place, in calling the historical sense the original sense ("sens original du texte"), he seems to deny that the dogmatic sense can be thus designated, although, seeing that this is the true sense of the Bible and is really contained in the text of the Bible, it cannot but be the original sense, unless we are determined to juggle with words. And if the writer by those expressions only wished to point out that the Biblical sense, when propounded by the teaching of the Church, appears with greater clearness than it does in the original text of Scripture, he says what is true, but the manner of his saying it is awkward and open to wrong interpretation.

The way in which this writer describes the function of the critic engaged in the study of Scripture, is no less obscure, not to use a harsher word.

"Le second (le travail du critique), même quand il s'agit de la Bible, se fonde sur une expérience scientifique et se règle comme une recherche de science."[24] "Le travail critique . . . en tant qu'historique et critique, a en lui-même sa raison d'être, sa méthode, et il en peut tenir que de lui-même les conclusions qui conviennent à sa nature propre."[25]

[24] *Autour*, p. 50. [25] P. 52.

Neither do we contend that the critic should appeal to the teaching of the Church in his interpretation of the Bible; but it does not, therefore, follow that he is altogether independent of the Church's teaching, and can draw his conclusions for himself, as in matters of science which do not touch revelation. Although the teaching of the Church is not a positive norm, it is a negative norm for his guidance; so that, although the critic gets no light from the Church for the interpretation of the Bible, the Catholic critic may not adopt as certain an interpretation which is at variance with the teaching of the Church. When the Church has defined the sense of a text, the critic may perhaps say that this sense is not apparent in the context by itself, so that as a critic he cannot affirm that the sense is certain; but he must not deny it. Nor is this to profess as true what is historically false ("proclamer vrai ce qui au point de vue de l'histoire est faux"), unless we admit that we can have historical certainty opposed to dogmatic certainty. The critic should allow that his method is not the only way to arrive at conclusions, and that sometimes criticism cannot get at the sense of a passage without any fear of mistake.

If the view that the author of the Apocalypse affirmed as certain the proximity of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ to judge mankind, is repugnant to the dogma of inspiration, the Catholic critic may not take this opinion, as is evident, even though it may be the first to suggest itself to the reader.

So far we have supposed that there is only one sense in Holy Scripture that is called historical or dogmatic, according as it is considered in the text alone or as it is propounded by the teaching of the Church.[26] But may it not be that two distinct senses in the same Biblical text are possible, and that therefore the historical may be different from the dogmatic sense? This is what Fr. Lagrange seems to indicate in explaining one of the propositions of the Encyclical of Leo XIII, *Providentissimus Deus*. These are the words of the eminent Dominican: "Parmi celles-ci (des raisons de convenance relativement au pouvoir de l'Eglise) il en

[26] Here, of course, is left out of consideration the typical sense, which, as is commonly said, consists in things rather than in words.

est une alleguée dans l'Encyclique 'Providentissimus,' qui me paraît, si je la comprends bien, d'une admirable profondeur: 'Eorum enim verbis auctore Spiritu Sancto res multae subjiciuntur quae humanae vim aciemque rationis longissime vincunt, divina scilicet mysteria et quae cum illis continentur aliis multa; idque nonnumquam ampliore quadam et reconditiore sententia, quam exprimere littera et hermeneuticae leges indicare videntur.' Ces paroles semblent faire allusion à un sens en quelque sorte supra-litteral qui ne peut être déterminé que par une autorité competente. Du moment qu'on croit à l'inspiration des Ecritures il faut admettre qu'elles contiennent plus que le sens obvie et purement littéral; en tous cas l'auteur de toute l'Ecriture étant le même, on peut expliquer une de ses pensées par une autre. On peut aller plus loin. Le Révélateur de la tradition est le même que l'Auteur de l'Ecriture, la pensée de l'Ecriture peut donc être commentée par les vérités de la tradition. Mais le Saint Père nous le fait remarquer, il peut arriver que cette interprétation dépasse de beaucoup le sens obvie tel qu'il résulterait des régles de l'herméneutique. Au fond c'est le systeme ancien, transmis à l'Eglise par la Synagogue. A prendre un texte en soi, on n'en tirerait pas cette conclusion: elle apparait cependant comme une résultante par la confrontation avec une autre vérité, affirmée par le même Esprit de Dieu. Rien ne découle plus clairement du dogme de l'Inspiration que cette méthode; rien n'ouvre un champ plus large au caprice et à l'arbitraire des interprétations privées. Si la pensée ainsi rapprochée du texte à expliquer est vraiment tirée de l'Ecriture ou de la Tradition, on aura une conclusion certaine; si c'est une pensée quelconque, nous tombons dans le caprice infini des arguties rabbiniques. Pour le dire en un mot, une pareille exégése ne peut émaner que de l'autorité de l'Eglise, dépositaire de toute la Révélation. Elle seule—aprês le Christ et les Apôtres—peut donner à un texte ce sens supra-littéral."[27]

Bonaccorsi, who quotes the entire passage, seems to be of the same opinion.[28]

If Fr. Lagrange wished only to say that in Scripture there is not merely the literal sense which is expressed by the words, but also the typical or spiritual sense which is expressed by things,

[27] *Revue Biblique*, 1900, p. 141. [28] *Loc. cit.*, p. 202.

well and good. All Catholics admit that, and it agrees with what he says elsewhere.[29] When the Church defines the meaning of a text, she seems to intend rather the literal than the typical sense.[30] But if he is speaking of the sense which is in the words of Scripture, although it cannot perhaps with certainty be gathered from them by the rules of grammar and criticism, this should be called not the supra-literal, but the literal sense. If it is contained in the words, it is expressed by the words, and if it is not expressed by the words, it is not in the words. But the sense expressed by the words must be the literal sense. It is true that this sense is at times not evident to the critic, and that the Church alone can define it; but this is only to say that the words are obscure, and the Church does nothing but remove the obscurity, so that the sense which was really though obscurely in the words becomes apparent. In this case also the historical only differs from the dogmatic sense in its degree of clearness.

We may look at the question in another way. As Fr. Lagrange says,[31] it may be that the inspired writer, or the secondary author, had no idea of the spiritual sense which was in the things. In a similar way may it not be that God, the primary Author of Scripture, by the words which may have a double sense, wishes to express a meaning distinct from that of the secondary author and unknown to him? In this hypothesis the historical sense—that which is intended by the inspired writer—would certainly, at least inadequately, be distinct from that intended by God, which might be propounded by the Church, and so be the dogmatic sense.

I do not wish to express an opinion about this theory, which seems to imply a twofold literal sense. I readily admit that the secondary author does not always perceive the sense of the words with that clearness and fulness which those words, as spoken or written by him, have in the mind of God; there are abundant examples of this, especially in the Prophets. Nor do I deny that sometimes the sense intended by God goes beyond that which is intended by him who received the inspiration. We have an

[29] *Rev. Bibl.*, 1896, p. 505.

[30] *Cf.* Conc. Trid., Sess. XIV, Can. III, "*Si quis dixerit verba . . .*"

[31] *Revue Biblique*, 1896, p. 506.

example in St. John 2: 49–52, where Caiphas, the high-priest, said: "You know nothing. Neither do you consider that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." The sense in which he said this is obvious. But the Evangelist adds: "And this he spoke not of himself: but being the high-priest of that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation." So that by the words of the high-priest God expressed a meaning that was altogether hidden from the high-priest.[32]

It should be said, however, that this is a solitary example. Moreover, Caiphas was not inspired to write, but to speak. Besides, the words are explained in their true sense by the Evangelist; and the meaning of Caiphas was not that intended by God, and so there was not in his words a twofold divine sense, but only one. Hence we cannot draw a general conclusion from this exceptional instance.

But let us suppose that the twofold sense is admitted as a hypothesis to explain the difference which seems to exist between the sense which is obtained from the text and that which is propounded by the Church, so that the former is the meaning of the inspired writer and of God, and thus truly divine, while the other is the meaning intended by God alone. Can the dogmatic sense, in this case at least, be said to be really distinct from the historical?

It seems to me that this is a mere question of words; provided that it is clear what opinion is to be held, it does not much matter in what terms it is expressed. However, let me add a few words on the subject, because an inaccurate use of terms is apt to lead to false ideas, inasmuch as the reader has only the author's words, and not what he meant by them, to guide him.

If it be supposed, as it should be, that the dogmatic sense is really the sense of Scripture, then the whole solution depends on the definition of the historical sense. This, according to the common usage of writers, may be said to be "the obvious sense," "the grammatical sense," "the sense which is gathered from the text

[32] "Secundum sensum, quem ipse Caiphas in iis verbis intellexit, ea dixit a semetipso; at quatenus haec eadem verba in se, uti sonant, egregie enuntiant mortem Jesu utilem fore et expedientem saluti, ea non dixit a semetipso. Voluit autem Deus, ut ea eligeret verba quibus redemptio apte significaretur, voluit ut prophetaret, quia erat Pontifex." (P. Knabenbauer, *In Evang. S. Jo.*, p. 368.)

according to the rules of hermeneutics,' "the sense which the inspired author had in his mind and wished to express."

If we accept these definitions or descriptions of the term, it is plain that the dogmatic sense may differ from the historical sense, for it may be that the former is neither obvious, nor gathered from the text according to the rules of hermeneutics, nor known *ex hypothesi* to the inspired writer who therefore could not have intended to express it.

There are so many eminent writers who admit this concept of the historical sense, that I do not dare to reject it. It may however be permitted to me to propose another. Without giving any judgment about the mind of these authors, we may gather from their own words that they consider that to be the historical sense which is really discovered in the text, which is actually expressed by the words of the inspired writer. Why then should we not define the term according to this general and characteristic note? Accordingly, that may be said to be the historical sense which is immediately [33] contained in the words of Scripture and is expressed by them. It is of little moment whether this sense is got from the text by the use of the rules of criticism, or not; whether the secondary author, or only God, the primary Author, wished to give expression to it. These are elements that do not belong to the essence of the historical sense, and they may be found associated with it, or without it. If such a sense is really expressed by the words, it is really the literal, the historical sense, whether the primary or the secondary author give expression to it, whether it is got at by the critic, or by the Church. These circumstances do not affect that condition, which alone is required that the sense may be called literal and historical,—the condition, namely, that it be immediately contained in the words of Scripture, and expressed by them.

But if the historical sense be understood in this way, it is clear that the dogmatic sense can never be different from it. If the Church defines the sense of a text, the critic may perhaps say: "I do not discover this meaning in the text, examined by the mere rules of hermeneutics; if the mere conditions of time, place, and

[33] The typical sense is also contained in the words, but only mediately, not immediately.

so forth, be considered, the inspired writer would not seem to have wished to express this meaning." But the critic will never be able to assert that the sense which has been defined by the Church is not to be found in the text, or to deny that it is the real, literal,[34] historical sense.

Should anyone say that he would call only that the historical sense which appears in the text, regard being had to the historical conditions, I again answer that I am not disputing about a mere term, and that I do not care much about words, provided that we are clear about the substance. But since the historical sense is often called the primitive, original, literal sense, it is very easy to draw the conclusion that this is the sense which is truly contained in the words, and that the dogmatic sense which is neither primitive nor literal, is not really contained in the words; hence the former is the true and real sense of the text, and the other is not.

I hope the reader will not consider what I have written as altogether useless. If I have misrepresented anyone's opinion, I trust it will be imputed to the difficulty of the subject, not to any ill will on my part.

A. F. TRUYOLS, S.J.

St. Beuno's College,
St. Asaph, North Wales.

CHURCH BELLS.

BELLS, though spoken of in the Old Testament as connected with the priestly ornaments and altar service, have become the peculiar symbol of Christian worship. The Church makes varied use of them in her liturgy; they are her voice by which she calls the faithful to her services, expresses her communion with the dead, banishes the spirits of evil, and invokes manifold blessings upon the creature whom original sin had deprived of the

[34] I suppose that the Church speaks of the sense which is signified by the words, not by the things. "*Si quis dixerit verba illa Domini Salvatoris. . . .:*" Conc. Trident., Sess. XIV, can. III. I do not wish to assert that the sense of a text defined by the Church was not intended by the inspired writer; I only say that if it were so, even in this case, the dogmatic sense would not be adequately distinguished from the historical.

power to benefit man. Hence the ritual prescribes a christening and consecration of bells, which solemn act is reserved to the bishop.

The first liturgical use of bells in the Christian Church goes back so far that its actual origin has remained a matter of conjecture. The Latin names *nola* and *campana* have given rise to time-honored legends which make *Nola*, a city in the Italian Campagna, the cradle of bells, and associate St. Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, with the first practice of placing bells on the roofs or towers of churches. A distinction must of course be made when we speak of the origin of church bells, between those here under consideration and those mentioned in Ecclesiasticus, where Aaron is spoken of as being compassed round about with many little bells of gold.[1] Bells wrought of sheet metal, beaten and riveted (*vasa productilia*), were made in very remote times; but bells cast in mould (*vasa fusilia*) are of much later date, and their invention is commonly attributed to the Irish monks of the fifth century.

The first use of these cast bells, which were commonly of larger size, was probably suggested by the necessity of calling to prayer and other common exercises the monks of the large monastic communities. Wooden clappers and riveted bells failed to serve such a purpose; and the use of trumpets, which had been a tradition in the Hebrew Church as a means to gather the people for public devotion, seemed probably too closely allied to those martial habits which, whilst quite in harmony with the Jewish or Maccabean economy, were not suggestive of the peace and retirement sought for in the religious institutions of the followers of Christ.

Ireland the Cradle of Bells.

The flourishing monasticism in Ireland during the fifth century made some such means as convent and chapel bells a comparative necessity; and it is commonly asserted that St. Fortchern, Bishop of Athrym (Athrumia, Athrimna, or Trim, in the County Meath), to whom the monastery of Kill-Fortchern (Roscurense), in the province of Leinster, owes its origin, was the inventor of cast bells. During the sixth century such bells were common enough, not

[1] Eccli. 45 : 10.

only in Ireland, but wherever the monks had penetrated as communities. Dagaeus, a monk of Bangor, who died in 586, is said to have cast more than three hundred bells. Another famous maker of bells was Tancho, a monk of St. Gall in Switzerland, where the Irish missionaries made their earliest settlements on the Continent. In a very short time the use of bells had become so widespread that Pope Sabinian (602–604) issued a special legislation regulating the ringing of bells for the Canonical Hours. Bells were introduced into the Eastern Church in the year 865, when Orso I, Doge of Venice, presented twelve large bronze bells to the Greek Emperor Michael III. They were hung in a tower specially built for the purpose, adjoining St. Sophia, at Constantinople. Thence the use of bells spread throughout the Orient, until their use, as publicly proclaiming the Christian faith, was forbidden by the conquering Mohammedans. Ever since the Crescent replaced the Cross on the Bosphorus, bells have been silenced wherever the Mussulman holds sway.

As bells were invented in Ireland, it was the Celtic tongue which supplied most languages with a word for bell.[2]

The wooden clappers which were in use previous to the

[2] The etymology of the word, which is *clock* in English, is set forth by Skeat, *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, 3 ed., v. "Clock," as follows: "The origin of the word (clock) is disputed, and great difficulty is caused by its being so widely spread; still, the Celtic languages give a clear etymology for it, which is worth notice, and Fick sets down the word as Celtic. *Cf.* Irish *clog*, a bell, clock; *clogan*, a little bell; *clogaim*, I ring or sound as a bell; *clogas*, a belfry; all secondary forms from the older *clagaim*, I make a noise, ring, cackle; *clag*, a clapper of a mill; *clagaire*, a clapper of a bell; *clagan*, a little bell, noise; all pointing to the Irish root *clag*, to clack. So Gaelic *clog*, a bell, clock; *clog*, to sound as a bell; *clag*, to sound as a bell, make a noise; *clagadh*, ringing, chiming, etc. So Welsh *clock*, a bell; *cleca*, to clack; *clegar*, to clack, tattle; *clocian*, to cluck, etc. Cornish, *cloch;* Manx, *clagg*, a bell. In other languages we find Low Latin, *clocca cloca*, a bell (whence F. *cloche*); Dutch, *Klok*, bell, clock; Icelandic, *Klukka*, old form *Klocka*, a bell; Danish, *Klokke*, a bell, clock; Swedish, *Klocka*, a bell, clock, bell-flower; Dutch, *Klok*, a clock, orig. a bell; German, *Glocke*, a bell, clock." He adds: "The *clock* was so named from its striking, and from the bell which gave the sound."

The English word bell is of purely English origin and signifies to make a sound, bellow, to bell, said of deer. *Cf.* G., *bellen;* A. S., *bellan*. The Latin word for bells, *campana*, is derived from *campus*, field, ground, and refers to the fact that bells were cast in a mould set in the ground. Hence bells were called *signa in campo fusa*, or *signa campana*, or simply *campana*.

invention of bells are still employed in divine service from after the *Gloria* of the Mass on Maundy Thursday till the *Gloria* of the Mass on Holy Saturday, during which time all ringing of bells ceases as a mark of mourning over our Lord's death. Bells were likewise silenced throughout an interdicted realm, in token of deathlike mourning at the misfortune which overwhelmed the land that had been guilty of a crime to cause such a censure.

Bell-Christening.

Pope John XIII blessed the new bell of St. John Lateran A. D. 968 and named it "John." This is the first instance on record of christening bells. The ceremony of blessing, or, as it is often called, christening bells, is both interesting and instructive. It sums up all the sacred ideas associated with the use of bells in the liturgy and in Christian life. After the recitation of Psalms 50, 53, 56, 66, 69, 85, 129, the bishop blesses the water to be used in the christening. With this water he sprinkles the bell or bells both within and without. Thereupon two clerics wash the bells with sponges dipped in the blest water, and then wipe them dry with a towel. Next the bells are consecrated with the holy chrism. After Psalms 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150 have been recited, the bishop anoints with Holy Oil the bells on the outside, at the spots previously indicated by chalk marks in the form of a cross; these marks are effaced before the act of anointing takes place. In like manner the inside of the bell is signed with chrism. Meanwhile the prescribed psalms and prayers are recited. A chafing-dish containing live coal, upon which is strewn thyme, incense, and myrrh, is placed under the bowl of each bell, so that the latter may receive the smoking perfume. Finally the passage of the Gospel in which the twofold aspect of the active and contemplative religious life is set forth in the persons of Martha and Mary ministering to our Lord, is chanted by the deacon. After the blessing is given, a cleric rings each bell thrice by means of a chord tied to the bell-tongue, to indicate that he who is to guard the church (*ostiarius*), a cleric in minor orders, now takes full charge of the bells. The spiritual significance of the bell thus blessed is well indicated in the words of the bene-

diction pronounced over it by the bishop after the anointing. It reads as follows :—[3]

"O God, who through Blessed Moses, the lawgiver, Thy servant, didst prescribe that silver trumpets should be made, through which when sounded by the priests at the time of sacrifice, the people, reminded by their sweet strains, would make ready to worship Thee, and would assemble to offer sacrifice—and encouraged to battle by the clangor of these same trumpets, would overcome the onslaughts of their enemies, grant, we beseech Thee, that this vessel (*these vessels*) prepared for Thy Holy Church, may be sanctified by the Holy Ghost, so that, through its (*their*) touch, the faithful may be invited to a reward. And when its (*their*) melody shall fall upon the ears of the people, may they receive an increase of Faith ; may all the snares of the enemy, the crash of hail-storms, hurricanes, the violence of tempests be driven far away ; may the deadly thunder be weakened, may the winds become salubrious, and be kept in check : may the right-hand of Thy strength overcome the powers of the air, so that hearing this bell (*these bells*) they may tremble and flee before the standard of the holy Cross of Thy Son depicted upon it (*them*) to whom every knee bows of those that are in heaven, on earth, and under the earth, and every tongue confesses that our Lord Jesus Christ, swallowing up death upon the gibbet of the Cross, reigneth "in the glory of God the Father" (Phil. 2 : 10), with the same Father and the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen."

Names and Inscriptions.

In harmony with the symbolical and sacramental act of christening bells we have also the custom of assigning sponsors and of giving them the names of saints. This custom dates back to a remote period. An entry under date 1499 may serve to illustrate the fact: "Payed for halowing of the Bell named Harry, VI s. VIII d. and ovir that Sir Will[m] Syms, Richard Clech, and Maistress Smyth, being Godfathers and Godmoder at the consecracyon of the same Bell, and beryng all oth' costs to the Suffrygan." [4]

[3] See *Right of the Blessing of a Bell* or of Several Bells, according to the Roman Pontifical with additions to the Rubrics, by the Rt. Rev. J. S. M. Lynch, LL.D., D.D. The Cathedral Library Association, 571 Fifth Ave., New York.

[4] Brand, Observations on Popular Antiquities, art. Passing Bell.

The name of the bell was generally embodied in some suitable inscription. The following are some specimens.

Benedicta sit Trinitas.
Trinitate sacra fiat haec campana beata.
Est mihi collatum I. H. S. istud nomen amatum.
Sunt mihi spes hii tres xp's Maria Joh'es.
Sum rosa pulsata mundi Maria vocata.
Est mea vox grata dum sim Maria vocata. A. D. MCCCCIIII.
Personet haec coelis dulcissima vox Gabrielis.
Missi di coelo habeo nomen Gabrielis.
In multis annis Personet campana Johannis.
Sce. Petre. o. p. x. I. H. S.
Ultima sum trina vocor Katerina.
Et nomen dicti Gero sc'i B'ndicti.

The oldest known inscription on any bell in England is that of St. Chad, Lichfield. It runs thus: "O beate [sic] Maria. A. D. 1255."[5]

The spiritual powers embodied in the bell through the blessing as a sacramental, as also the uses of a church-bell in general, often form the theme of the inscriptions. Beautiful and significant is the following:

Laudo Deum verum, plebem voco, congrego clerum,
Defunctos ploro, nimbum fugo, festa decoro.

The same idea is more fully developed thus:

En ego campana nunquam denuntio vana,
Laudo Deum verum, plebem voco, congrego clerum,
Defunctos plango, vivos voco, fulgura frango.
Vox mea vox vitae, voco vos ad sacra, venite.

The last line is sometimes changed to the following:

Dum trahor, audite! voco vos ad sacra, venite!

And the following verses were added:—

Sanctos collando, tonitrua fugo, funera claudo,
Funera plango, fulgura frango, Sabbatha pango:
Excito lentos, dissipo ventos, paco cruentos.

These lines formed a common storehouse for those intent on devising inscriptions for bells. The most ingenious inscription is

[5] Archæological Journal, 48, p. 55.

doubtless the following, which reads so that the verb of the first line has for its object the corresponding word in the second line :—

> Convoco, signo, noto, compello, concino, ploro,
> Arma, dies, horas, fulgura, festa, rogos.

Morning Bell and Curfew Bell.

The morning bell ushered in the day, and the curfew bell rang in the night. The morning bell was rung at sunrise, hence earlier in summer than in winter, even as early as four o'clock. Curfew was rung at eight or nine at night. In olden times folks certainly believed in the popular rhyme :—

> Early to bed and early to rise
> Makes a man healthy, wealthy, and wise.

Or, as another proverb has it :—

> If thou wouldst thrive, rise at five ;
> If thou hast thriven, rise at seven ;
> He who would never thrive may lie till eleven.

The curfew law was universally in force throughout Europe during the Middle Ages. At the ringing of the curfew bell all hearth fires were covered or banked ; hence the name curfew, derived from old French *couvre feu*, cover the fire. William the Conqueror enacted the law of the Curfew Bell as a police regulation intended to prevent the Saxons from gathering and concocting conspiracies against the Normans. This curfew law was abolished by Henry I ; but it continued in force long afterwards as a precaution against fire, even as it existed in England long before the Conqueror. Alfred the Great embodied the curfew law in his code. In Latin it was known as *hora ignitegii*. Nor can we consider the law as meaningless, if we are mindful of the fact that in those times wooden houses and churches thatched with straw were common so that conflagrations, once started, created no end of havoc.

The Angelus.

The beginnings of the Angelus proceeded originally from the Morning Bell and Curfew Bell. It was natural for people to asso-

ciate morning and night prayers with the ringing of the bell which invited them to rise and retire.

Although Pope Gregory IX (1227–1241) ordered the bell to be rung in the evening that the people might pray for the success of the Crusades, and St. Bonaventure a half century later exhorted the Franciscans to propagate the "Evening *Ave*," it is to Pope John XXII that the Angelus owes its origin. This Pope, a devout client of Our Blessed Lady, granted in 1327 to all who would say three Aves during the ringing of the curfew, an indulgence of 10—some say 20—days.[6]

At the synod of Lavaur (near Toulouse), France, A.D. 1368, it was decreed that at the ringing of a bell in the morning five *Paters* in honor of the Five Wounds of our Lord, and seven *Aves* in honor of the Seven Joys of Our Lady should be recited. In the following year these prayers were reduced to three *Paters* and *Aves*. In the year 1456 Pope Callixtus III ordered the bells throughout Christendom to be rung at noon to call upon the faithful to pray for the Crusaders then battling with the Turk. Twelve years later King Louis XI of France enforced the ringing of the morning, noon, and evening Angelus throughout his realm. Gradually the practice was becoming universal.

The earliest known record of the Angelus prayer as now in use is found in the *Officium Parvum B. M. V.*, as revised and edited by order of Pope Pius V (1566-1572). These prayers consist of three *Aves*, preceded respectively by three antiphons, followed by versicle and oration. From the first antiphon, *Angelus Domini*, etc., the term *Angelus* derives its use. In England it was known of old as the *Gabriel Bell;* also as *Ave Bell* or *Ave Maria Bell.* The bell used for the Angelus was generally christened Gabriel or Ave.

Soul Bell, Passing Bell, Death Peal.

Associated with the evening Angelus is the *De profundis*,—that is, prayers for the faithful departed. It is the custom in many churches to ring, immediately after the evening Angelus, a smaller bell. This bell is sometimes called the Soul Bell, a term which of old was also applied to the Passing Bell, just as the word

[6] *Our Lady's Dowry.* By the Rev. T. E. Bridgett, C.SS.R., p. 216.

Soulmas was used to designate the second of November. In many churches in the United States the Soul Bell is tolled one hour after the evening Angelus. This devout custom, which one meets, for example, everywhere in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, was originated in the City of Naples in the year 1546. St. Cajetan, founder of the Clerks Regular, known as Theatines, originated the practice, which has spread into all Catholic countries.

In Rome the Soul Bell is rung one hour after the evening Angelus.[7] The Psalm (129) *De profundis* or else a *Pater* and *Ave* together with the versicles: "Eternal rest grant unto them, O Lord," and "Let perpetual light shine upon them. May they rest in peace. Amen"—must be recited kneeling during the ringing of the Soul Bell. Where the bell is not rung, the indulgences can be gained by saying the prescribed prayers an hour after the Angelus.

In olden times it was customary in England, and is so still in Catholic countries, to toll a bell when a person of the parish was dying or had just expired. This was called the Passing Bell. If the dying person was a male, the bell tolled thrice in succession; if a woman, twice. The bell is tolled twice or thrice for each decade of years which the dying or deceased person has attained. Since the parishioners frequently know those who in their neighborhood are very sick or at the point of death, they easily tell from the manner of tolling who has expired.

An old proverb refers to the Passing Bell in the following words:

> When the bell begins to toll,
> Lord have mercy on the soul!

This is in itself a prayer. The following wise sentiment likewise took its origin from the Passing Bell:

> When thou dost hear a toll or knell,
> Then think upon thy Passing Bell.

Shakespeare refers to the Passing Bell in *Henry IV:*

> And his tongue
> Sounds ever after as a sullen bell,
> Remembered knolling a departing friend.

[7] An indulgence of 100 days each time, a plenary indulgence once a year, after receiving the Sacraments and praying for the usual intentions, is attached to this practice.

"Death Peal" was a common designation given to the tolling of bells at funerals. For the Death Peal, the bell was somewhat muffled "by tying pieces of Leather, old Hat, or any other thing that is pretty thick, round the ball of the clapper."[8]

Sacring Bell.

Another bell which dates from old times and which is not altogether unknown in modern times, although its proper name has fallen into oblivion, is the *Sacring Bell.* Sacring meant consecration. John Myrc, a fifteenth century writer, in his Instructions to Parish Priests, says:

> "And when they hear the bell ring
> To the holy 'sakering,'
> Teach them kneel down, both young and old,
> And both their hands up to hold,
> And say then in this manner," etc.

Then follows the prescribed prayer.

In many parishes in this country the Sacring Bell is rung on Sundays and holidays at the consecration during High Mass. The bell is rung thrice at the elevation of the Host and thrice again at the elevation of the Chalice. The ringing of the little bell at the altar serves as a sign to the bell-ringer to announce the glad tidings to the people in their homes. The devout at home immediately kneel down upon hearing it and join in prayer with the faithful in church. It is certainly a beautiful practice, which should on its own merits recommend itself to general use. Of the many little acts of piety suggested for the purpose, the following, probably by Richard Rolle of Hampole, a saintly hermit and mystic of England in the fourteenth century, and a voluminous writer, deserves special mention.[9]

> Praised be Thou, King,
> And blessed be Thou, King,
> Of all Thy gifts good,

[8] Brand, *l. c.*

[9] *Yorkshire Writers: Richard Rolle of Hampole and His Followers.* C. Horstman. II vol. New York: Macmillan & Co. *Lay-Folks' Mass-Book*, vol. i, p. 6. The version here followed is that given by T. F. Simmons, M.A., *Lay-Folks' Mass-Book*, p. 40 and xxix.

And thanked be Thou, King,
Jesu, all my joying,
That for me spilt Thy blood
And died upon the Rood;
Thou give me grace to sing
The song of Thy praising.

All the sentiments which pervade the devout soul at the moment of consecration are contained in this prayer. The rhyme aids to impress it upon the memory. The old *Lay-Folks' Mass-Book* would bear resurrection. Our finest liturgical literary treasures have indeed been hidden away under dust accumulated for centuries.

This devotion is furthermore encouraged by the Church and enriched by indulgences.[10] In Catholic countries the Sacring Bell is rung during the conventual or parish Mass, or, as it is called among us, late Mass.

Other Bells.

Yet another beautiful devotion which makes use of bells is the Friday afternoon devotion, for which there appears to be no special name in our folk-lore, although the devotion was practised centuries ago. At a synod held at Olmutz, Germany, in 1413, the obligation was imposed upon church wardens to ring the bell at noon on Fridays in honor of the Passion and Death of our Lord. The devotion became universal by order of Pope Benedict XIV.[11]

There is one other practice which deserves mention: it is contained in the following entry of an old English church record: "Then, the said Saxon or his Deputy, every Saturday, Saint's Even and principal Feasts (eves of) *shall ring noon* with as many bells as shall be convenient to the Saturday, Saint's Even, and principal Feasts (eves of)."[12] This custom is also practised

[10] Pope Gregory XIII (1572–1585) granted the following indulgences: One year each time to all who at the sound of the Sacring Bell kneel down and pray at home, in the field, or on the street, or wherever they may be.

[11] Brief "Ad passionis," dated December 13, 1740. To all who at the stroke of this bell, commonly tolled on Friday afternoon at three o'clock, kneel down and recite five *Paters* and *Aves* an indulgence of 100 days is granted.

[12] Brand, *ib.*, On Saturday afternoon.

in many parishes in the United States and Canada. For this purpose all the church bells are usually rung together after the evening Angelus, or after the Soul Bell (where it is rung) on the said vigils.

Something might be said here in conclusion regarding the language of bells, if the phrase be permissible. In England, and for that matter, in all Christendom, bells were rung according to a system which, although not uniform throughout, was fundamentally unique. For the different services the bells had a method of ringing. Tunes were played, not as is now commonly done by means of chimes uttering popular airs, but set tunes indicating the character of the service which next occurred. The system was very complex, yet quite intelligible to those who were familiar with the system of festival celebration.

HENRY BORGMANN, C.SS.R.

Saratoga, N. Y.

THE TRAINING OF A WEALTHY PARISHIONER.

CHAPTER I.

Father Sinclair Unearths a Nefarious Scheme.

THE West End of Laurenboro had been deserted all summer. Ever since the first days of July, what with barred doors, closed blinds, awnings drawn, and noiseless streets, the aristocratic quarter of the great metropolis looked like a city of the dead. The urban wealth and fashion had transferred its quarters for the time being either to the Maine coast, with its invigorating salt-breezes, or to the cool and inviting regions of the Lower St. Lawrence; and those who were particularly in search of health and diversion, had gone to the mountain haunts of the Adirondacks, or found change amid trans-Atlantic scenery and tourist life in the Scotch Highlands or the Continental Alps. Altogether the territory had been vacated, and except for the appearance, here and there, of some solitary gardener dawdling aimlessly about the premises, and the undisturbed warbling of the song-birds in the maples, there was absolutely no sign of life.

No such changes had taken place in the Gottingen quarter, where the poor and the working classes lived. There the warm summer months were spent, as usual, amid the ceaseless hum of factory life. Men and women bustled and toiled from dawn to night, in shop and workroom, in courtyard and street, for the bread they were to eat. For them there was no ocean breeze or bracing mountain air, which God had made so liberally, and if the stirring summer wind that gently fans the cheek of rich and poor alike, found its way into the Gottingen quarter, it had already lost half its freshness and soothing power. For all that, the want of bodily comforts did not destroy the peace of mind in the poor people who dwelt here. They were Catholics for the most part, and faithful to the teachings of the Church, who did not look on poverty as an evil, but rather as a means established by God to procure them an eternal reward in heaven. The Gottingen poor were satisfied with their condition, thanks to their faith and the teaching of a zealous and enlightened pastor.

> To will what God doth will, that is the only science
> That gives us rest,

was a lesson they had long since learned; and contentment, if not gratitude for their lot, reigned among those who toiled for their daily sustenance.

Father Sinclair spent much of his time among them. He kept his eye on all, and during the summer months, when he took the annual parish census, he made it a point to welcome the new arrivals which the immigration season usually brought in considerable numbers. It was then also that he made his plans for their betterment, through the organized means of parish unions among the better-to-do people in the neighborhood, who were practically out of his reach during the vacation season, but on whom he depended during the winter months for practical assistance. He himself rarely took a midsummer holiday. Not that the pastor of St. Paul's was averse to legitimate recreation. On the contrary; he often urged those of his faithful parishioners who, whilst they had the means and leisure to go out of town, hesitated to abandon the interests of Catholic settlement work which they had undertaken at his request, to spend some weeks away from the stifling surroundings of their city habitats, and to

seek the wholesome atmosphere of country or seashore life. His own interests, he said, did not permit him to leave his post, unless it were for a short trip over the Great Lakes and down the river to the Gulf. And that luxury he had allowed himself but once in the ten years of his residence in the metropolis. If a brother priest argued the matter with him, he would readily acknowledge the principle of necessary recreation even for the shepherd of souls, after the arduous work of a twelve months' ministry in a large city; and, indeed, he never denied that a few weeks of rest in some quiet nook on the sea-coast would have been a welcome change to him often enough. But the trouble was he could never find the time. The clergy of the Religious Orders, who might have taken his place at other seasons of the year, were busy themselves during the summer months, giving retreats and preparing for mission or college work to begin in the autumn. At other times of the year, the interests of his people did not permit him to leave his flock; and to deprive them at any time of Mass or the Sacraments did not enter his head.

His habit therefore was to stay at home; but what recreation and useful information the want of travel and actual observation deprived him of, he amply made up for in useful reading. His taste, one might say passion, in this direction, was apparent to any casual visitor at the pastoral glebe-house. Books filled every nook and corner of the modest dwelling, including bedroom and hall. History, science, philosophy, poetry—treasures of thought and truth—carefully selected, were at his beck and call. He loved to hide himself away with these silent companions, in the quiet hours of night, to commune with the ever living thoughts of vanished minds, or to stray into strange fields of useful knowledge, to trace the tangled paths of legitimate speculation, and to lose himself in the reveries of scientific dreamland. With Mrs. Browning, he believed that

> We get no good
> By being ungenerous, even in a book,
> And calculating profits—so much help
> By so much reading. It is rather when
> We gloriously forget ourselves, and plunge
> Soul-forward, headlong, into a book's profound,
> Impassioned for its beauty, and salt of truth—
> 'Tis then we get the right good from a book.

One evening in the first week in August, he was seated in his study, carefully perusing a document which had reached him in the morning's mail. It was the semi-annual Report of the Elzevir Library, a pamphlet skilfully tabulated and printed, so that a reader could take in at a glance the work of that institution during the preceding six months.

Owing to the initiative of the Directors, the "Elzevir" had been a prominent name for years in Laurenboro. Founded by non-sectarian enterprise, it had remained a non-sectarian institution. Hence it did its best to please everybody. Readers of books in the city and suburbs knew the way to Elzevir on Fessenden Avenue; so that the pastor of St. Paul's was not surprised to learn, when he laid down the Report, that the circulation had gone into the thousands and was continually on the increase.

The needless emphasis laid upon the "non-sectarian" character of the Library by its promoters had often made Father Sinclair suspect that all was not right there. So far as he knew, Catholics had no voice in the management of the institution. The Board of Directors was made up of members of different religious denominations; and, as he had been informed, there was at least one professing atheist among them. He was aware, too, that many books antagonistic to truth were to be found on the shelves of the Elzevir, although the tabulated Report before him was silent regarding this phase of the circulation, and in fact no hint whatever was given as to the number of religious books called for by readers. A statement giving light in this direction would have interested Father Sinclair very much. One paragraph in the Report, however, caught his eye. It mentioned the fact of a recent legacy amounting to twenty-five thousand dollars which had been left to the institution. The passage that struck Father Sinclair read as follows:

> "The Directors are aware that while they desire to keep the Elzevir strictly non-sectarian, the presence of many religious denominations in Laurenboro renders it necessary to provide literature to suit the peculiar views of all, if their patronage is to be maintained. Resolved therefore, that the legacy of twenty-five thousand dollars recently bequeathed to the Elzevir, be expended in augmenting the supply of denominational literature, and in facilitating the circulation thereof."

Here was food for reflection; and the pastor reflected deeply. Laurenboro, a city more than half Catholic, without a Catholic library, was about to have a carload of denominational literature flung broadcast among its people. What sort would it be? How much of its anti-Catholic poison would be likely to find its way into Catholic homes?—for "Denominational Literature" unquestionably meant Protestant literature, with its prejudices, its misstatements, its bitterness against the Catholic Church. No one who had any knowledge of current works dealing with the subject of religion, could have any doubt that by far the larger number of books which the Elzevir directors were likely to place on their shelves, would be antagonistic to the faith of Father Sinclair's people. The pastor left his chair and paced the floor. A great plan suddenly leaped up in his mind. Its first forms were, indeed, crude; though very distinct, they were yet without manageable shape. As he continued to walk up and down, a definite scheme began to crystallize slowly. The motives that urged him were so very strong that they compelled action, and with that conviction his plan ripened and a new undertaking began to justify its own existence.

He lowered the light and went out on to the balcony, a restful spot on the south side of his rectory, which had once been the centre of a borough now incorporated in the city; for he had preferred to keep the single glebe-house on the outskirts of his parish, overlooking the river at some distance, whence it was not difficult to reach the factory quarter which constituted the knot of his parochial responsibility. It was a bright summer's night, and the moonbeams were turning to silver the riplets on the distant water's surface, suggesting the calm wealth of nature, and with it confidence in God's providing love. He stood for a moment to listen to the strains of music coming from the city band in the Eagle Rotunda, and to watch the dark silhouette of a large steamer which was moving out for an excursion down the river.

"Why not?" he continued to muse, as he paced up and down the balcony. "Why should not Laurenboro with its fifty thousand Catholics, have its own Catholic Library? In this city our foundlings and orphans are housed and nursed into adolescence; our poor are clothed and fed; the aged and incurable are soothed

in their last days; here every form of physical infirmity is tenderly cared for by Catholic charity. Is it not possible to be equally generous in allaying the infirmities of the mind? Thousands of dollars are spent every year by us in the care of diseased human bodies. Outside the ministry of the priesthood and the work of our two colleges and convents, what is Catholic charity in Laurenboro doing for souls? In this city we have no public sources of knowledge but the daily press and the Elzevir and Humboldt libraries. For years, hundreds of my flock have had to depend on these doubtful sources for their mind-food. And is not intellectual poverty and corruption a far greater evil than any that can afflict the body? What a change for the better would take place in the mental condition of my own people, if healthy reading were provided them. The result would be sound thinking, and its inevitable sequel, sound living." Thus spoke the priest unto himself.

Father Sinclair was a man of many resources; but he was the first to admit that, no matter how cogent the motives, the work of starting a new library under Catholic patronage in a city where two large book centres for the accommodation of the general public existed already, had many thorny sides to it. St. Paul's parish was, moreover, one of the smallest in Laurenboro. It embraced, as already stated, the new factory sites and tenements of the Gottingen district. This was on one side; on the other, where the lowlands led up to Ashburne Avenue, there lived a few of the wealthier families; there was hardly any middle class. The people were, as a rule, and according to their means, generous in the support of the parish. In the beginning, however, there had been some who showed themselves inclined to look askance at the zeal of the young pastor, and rather discouraged one or two of his projects for the betterment of the people, taking for granted that an excess of enthusiasm is best met by an excess of reserve. Perhaps their attitude found its justification in some unpromising financial ventures of one of the former pastors of the parish; but on this he did not reflect. He only recalled the struggle into which he found himself forced when he began the parochial school in Gottingen; also the almost cynical indifference which he encountered from the professional men of his district when he had undertaken to make some move toward maintaining a distinctly Catholic social life

among the students—strangers in Laurenboro—who attended Royalview University; there had likewise been a strong and unrelenting opposition to his personally undertaking the purchase of a section of the Helerand estate to serve as a home for incurables. But in these enterprises—to mention no others of a similar character—he had managed to overcome opposition and indifference by that quiet persistence which secures success in the work undertaken; and the very first to congratulate him on the evidence of actual results were those who had in the beginning bitterly opposed him.

Having these somewhat discouraging memories still vivid before him, Father Sinclair was forced to calculate in advance with the uprising of difficulties, much harder for the average sensitive man to overcome than physical hardship or mental labor in a good cause. On the other hand he remembered the devotion with which the bulk of his people had stood by him, freely opening their purses when he had shown to them the feasibility of a work, or when their own eyes had made it evident to them. The experiences, on the whole, of the last ten years urged him all the harder to solve a new problem. He went back to his study and sat down to work it out.

CHAPTER II.

"Pulling Wires."

The summer months passed rapidly away. October came, bringing with it a return of activity in the West End. Draymen laden with trunks; carpet-beaters at work; gardeners cropping the great undulating lawns and the summer's growth of shrubbery; maids rubbing a three months' dust from the steps and windows,—all bespoke an awakening in the fashionable part of Laurenboro. Soon the heavy carriages, rolling up to the mansions on Ashburne Avenue, told the passers-by that the *élite* had returned to resume their routine life of pleasure for the winter.

It was a raw and dreary afternoon, enlivened by a brisk gale from the southeast. The trees along the great wide avenue were shedding their sere leaves in myriads, and carpeting the gray asphalt. Workmen were busy putting up the winter windows in

the Melgrove mansion, covering the flower-beds, tying down the ivy, and preparing for the long white season, which, coming as it did rather early, threatened to be more severe than usual.

In a small rear parlor sat Mrs. Melgrove and two ladies, discussing the summer's outing. The hostess had just returned from Europe the week before, and was giving her impressions. She was a tall, finely proportioned woman of middle-age, with a genial manner and the evidences of culture in language and movement. God had blessed her with a goodly share of the world's wealth. During the past twenty years, her leisure moments, spared from her family, a husband and a little daughter, had been devoted to helping the poor, visiting the city hospitals and the sick in their homes. It was nothing to surprise anyone that the name of Mrs. Horace Melgrove should stand at the head of, and be identified with, several of the pious associations attached to St. Paul's Church.

Her two lady visitors were likewise well known as associates with her in various schemes for the betterment of the poor. The elder, Miss Rayford, was a quiet little woman of a distinctly literary turn of mind. She had, indeed, for years been predominantly occupied with works of out-door charity, but still found time to write attractive stories and other things of a thoughtful tendency that made her known in many Catholic homes not only of her own city but abroad. The other person in conference with Mrs. Melgrove was Mary Garvey,—a young lady, somewhat vivacious, impressionable, open to a fault, and energetic in everything she undertook to do or champion. Although she never seemed to feel the slightest hesitation to tell others her opinion of them, there was something in her manner and tone that robbed her outspoken way of the offensive element so commonly associated with criticism of any kind. This alone explains how she managed to keep herself out of trouble. The fact was, Miss Garvey was liked by everybody in St. Paul's parish; for no one doubted that her honest speech proceeded from a heart of gold, both pure and kind, however seemingly severe. Her parents, who had been in moderately good circumstances, died when she was but a little child, and she had fallen heir to a modest competency which allowed her ample leisure to devote herself to good works, a privilege she did not

fail to use. For some years, Mrs. Melgrove, Miss Rayford, and Miss Garvey had been, as already intimated, the recognized leaders in every charitable movement introduced among Father Sinclair's people. To-day they were to meet him at Mrs. Melgrove's house for a talk over some important enterprise.

"I wonder what it can be," said the hostess, looking at the note from the priest which she held in her hand, but the brief contents of which furnished no adequate clue as to the object of the prospective meeting. "No doubt, Father has some new scheme for the young people, but it is rather early to get us to work, with all the domestic and social demands of the return season upon us. Someone told me in Paris that the scheme for establishing parish beds in the Contagious Hospital had failed."

"Of course, it failed," returned Miss Garvey. "What else could you expect? The Newell family left town the very day our Hospital Committee was to meet; and naturally the outsiders stepped in and we lacked the requisite number of votes,—so there you are."

"There is something new brewing, at all events," said the hostess smiling.

"Undoubtedly," replied Miss Garvey. "I was out yesterday when Father Sinclair called, and I got his note only an hour ago. But from a few words he dropped in my hearing the other day, I infer that he plans some scheme for purchasing books. Did you know that the Elzevir people were going to extend their library along Fessenden Avenue?"

"I saw something to that effect in the *Times* yesterday;—you may be sure they will succeed in getting the necessary appropriation; they can control public patronage," answered Mrs. Melgrove.

It was close on three o'clock when the door-bell rang. A moment later Father Sinclair was ushered into the small parlor where the ladies were waiting.

He was a tall, well-built man, though seemingly not strong, about forty years of age, or little more, with an expression of face that indicated at once energy and delicacy. People recognized him as one of the prominent citizens of Laurenboro; and whilst one might have observed a certain distance between the priest

and the official arbiters of the town with whom he was thrown in contact, there was no lack of courtesy on either side when they met in the public thoroughfares. Father Sinclair had been assigned to duty as a parish priest soon after his ordination, seventeen years ago, in a small village on the coast, where his duties were light and where he had ample time for self-improvement. There he had enjoyed a season of comparative solitude, but also one of self-improvement and unconscious preparation for more difficult tasks in the future. He had found leisure for study, even for writing; and his articles in the different magazines, together with a published volume on the attitude of the Church toward Evolution, had given him a reputation among his brother priests for serious habits of study. It was not many years before his Ordinary felt that he might safely entrust the more important interests of a city-parish to the zeal and prudence of the young priest; and accordingly, upon the first vacancy in Laurenboro, he was transferred thither. The proposed change was a sore trial to him, and his more intimate friends were well aware that it had cost him no little sacrifice to leave behind him his books, or at least the solitude and leisure which made them especially valuable to him. He also loved his little flock and regretted to part from them, whatever else might be in store for him. By nature sensitive, retiring, a lover of the good and the beautiful in art—he had not yet discovered his own powers—he dreaded the responsibilities of the ministry, together with the noise and bustle of a large city. Hence, when the formal offer of the pastorship of St. Paul's came to him, he requested his superiors to let him retain his cure in Rockdale, where he was contented and thought himself useful proportionately to his talents. But the Archbishop knew the pastor better than the pastor knew himself, and insisted on compliance with his wishes. Father Sinclair, known to but few people outside his immediate circle, was promptly installed in the vacant parish, much to the surprise of older candidates and their friends.

Ten years had elapsed since then, and during the decade the pastor of St. Paul's had distinguished himself as an organizer who could carry to completion and sustain any work he had seen fit to undertake.

"You are more punctual than I, ladies. I hope I have not kept you waiting, although even that can scarcely have been a hardship in Mrs. Melgrove's cosy parlor this bleak afternoon," said Father Sinclair, genially, as he took his seat at the vacant side of the table. "You are curious, no doubt," he continued, "why I have asked you to meet so early in the season. It is to discuss a plan which seems to me feasible enough, if we get the proper seconding among our own people. If we succeed in carrying it through, it will do untold good in our midst, chiefly among our children and young people."

He drew from an inner pocket a notebook and unfolded a small sheet of paper on which he had jotted down some items for direction.

"You may have seen," he went on to say, "that the Elzevir—"

Miss Garvey gave a nod to the other ladies, as much as to say, "I told you it was a book scheme."

"—has been making bids during the summer to secure a larger patronage. There has been quite recently a legacy of twenty-five thousand dollars, which is intended, I am reliably informed, to extend the circulation of reading matter that trenches directly upon religious ground. At the same time, efforts are being made to get our children to patronize the library. I had a visit from two of the directors, a few days ago. Their plan is to establish a Children's Department, and to augment their stores of denominational literature. In order to do that, they are making arrangements to get some of our wealthy Catholics interested."

"They'll get Mr. Maglundy, sure, if they go after him," softly interjected Miss Garvey.

"Now, you know, ladies, as well as I do," continued the pastor, merely heeding the interruption by a pleasant nod of his head, "what a misfortune such an addition would be in a city like ours. There is to be no discrimination in the choice of books as far as religion is concerned. Everything is to be free and unsectarian. This was one of the provisions in the will of the benefactor; indeed, the directors who came to see me insisted on this point, as though it were a likely inducement to gain my approbation to the scheme of what they consider a public service of equal rights. Now non-sectarianism means non-Catholic; it means that

no preference is to be shown to any religion; it means indifferentism; it assumes the absurd tenet that God could be as well pleased with one religion as with another. It means that two men may propagate contradictory doctrines, and yet both be right. Now this is false; this is not even common sense. A denominational library here in Laurenboro including all sorts of pleas for and against religion would be a danger for our non-educated Catholics, because it would be unfair to their own creed, and we must do our best to keep it from doing them harm.

"Here, ladies, is a question for you to answer." Father Sinclair consulted his notes. "St. Paul's is a small parish, but we have, in this large city, over fifty thousand Catholics, with many wealthy families among them. Would it not be possible, by doing a little energetic work, to begin a library of our own—on a small scale at first—to meet this great want in our city? The collection of good books would not be so very difficult a matter; for we need not doubt that as soon as our people see the benefit which accrues to the Catholic cause from such an enterprise, they will aid it. I have no doubt that in time we will find some generous benefactor to whom the matter appeals equally strongly, and it will not be many years before we shall have a Catholic library, one such as we may be proud of."

"Pardon me, Father," interrupted Mrs. Melgrove, smiling, "if I seem to discourage your project by saying that I fear it will be hard to awaken the needed enthusiasm among our people to sustain the first attempts of such an enterprise. I need hardly say that viewed from a personal point and considering our needs, the scheme deserves our whole-souled approval. But it means so much. Am I wrong, for example, in thinking that it means that we should have to get a central site, a place in the city accessible to the Catholics from all parts? If we could open a library right here in our neighborhood, there might be only a little or at least less difficulty; but then who would come to it from town, who would be willing to aid us outside our own small parish of St. Paul's? Apart from the cost of maintaining a building or rooms in a convenient locality at probably high rent, not to speak of purchase, how would we get a sufficient stock of really good books to satisfy those readers who are now drawn to the Elzevir and

Humboldt libraries, because they find there almost anything they may look for? You would have to have a number of salaried librarians and secretaries,—all of which means constant and considerable expense. I speak with some assurance on the subject, because I have been interested and once tried a similar scheme, years ago in the Provinces. We started under the most favorable auspices with a building excellently located. But eventually we found the expenses for rent, salaries, the renewal and purchase of books, and other unforeseen items, such a drain on our resources that we were obliged to give up the matter in order to ward off serious complications."

"If you will allow me," said the priest, turning over his notes, "I have already given thought to what seemed to me the most likely and reasonable objections. Let me answer those that you have just made, Mrs. Melgrove."

While he was speaking, a maid came softly into the room and set a match to the spirit lamp; in a few minutes the samovar was steaming.

"In the first place, as to the site," continued Father Sinclair, "there is our Young Men's Club which is sufficiently central; the electric cars run all around it to every part of the city. On the second floor they have a very large room all wainscoted and tiled and heated by steam, which has been used as a general meeting-place in the evenings. The committee in charge of the club have told me that we may fit up this hall as a library in a way which need not divert it from its present use. They are perfectly content that we should have the place for an indefinite period without cost."

"There might be some opposition to putting ourselves under obligation to any local parish organization for the purpose of supplying reading matter for the others," urged Mrs. Melgrove.

"Such an objection would be entirely unreasonable," replied Father Sinclair. "I do not think that we can please everybody; and surely that should not prevent us from working."

The ladies smiled acquiesence.

"Let me dispose of your other objection,—the appointment of a librarian and salaries. As the proposed scheme could take the shape, at present, of only a circulating library, until we may see our

way clear to do something more, there is no reason why a couple of hours a week should not be sufficient to exchange books. Could we not secure the services of say five or six young ladies for two hours every Wednesday and Sunday afternoons?"

"There is no doubt about it," said Miss Rayford, who had kept silent up to this. "I know several who, I am sure, would be willing to come——"

"And Miss Garvey herself here," broke in Mrs. Melgrove; "she has had several years' experience in the Humboldt Institute. How many, Mary?"

"Barely five," the young lady answered, smiling.

"And thus endeth objection number two," said Father Sinclair. "Let us examine the third. This, to my mind, is the really serious one. Where are we going to get the books? It seems to me that we might organize a few Collecting Committees whose duties would be to look up old family libraries, whose owners might have no particular use for the volumes and be willing to give them as the nucleus for the forming of a Catholic public library. I know personally several families in this city who have books lying uselessly in closets and garrets, and who would be glad, I am sure, to donate them to an undertaking of this kind. All such books might not be equally useful, but the larger number would, no doubt, prove very acceptable, under the conditions. Others we should, of course, have to purchase, and the money for that purpose would have to be collected."

"Couldn't our friend across the avenue, Mr. Melling, be prevailed on to give us a few?" asked Miss Rayford; "and Mr. Homer Stewart? They are Catholics. They both give gold medals yearly to Royalview University; they helped to complete the Observatory. Surely it would not be difficult to induce them to donate fifty volumes each, if they were approached in the right way."

"I never had occasion to come into close contact with the gentlemen you mention, Miss Rayford. They belong to St. Basil's," interposed the pastor. "But my experience has taught me that there is little to be expected from our wealthy men who figure as nominal Catholics, unless you can hold out to them some equivalent of honor or fame, which I fear is not to be gained by

this apparent opposition to the more popular schemes in behalf of our existing and in a sense municipal library."

"Once more," insisted Miss Garvey, "I suggest the name of Mr. Silas Maglundy as a candidate for prospective honors in this line. He is not committed, I think, to any allegiance with the Elzevir people—at least not yet."

"Who is this Silas Maglundy, Miss Garvey?" asked Father Sinclair, looking up from his notepaper.

"Why, have you not heard? He is one of our recent arrivals," answered the little lady. "He has taken that large house, with the splendid grounds, corner of Howarth and Buell. They say he is a millionaire and a Catholic."

"A combination that one does not meet very frequently," returned the pastor. "Howarth and Buell Streets are within the limits of St. Paul's. I shall have to call on him and get him interested in our works. That's all."

Father Sinclair stood up.

"Now, ladies, will you ponder over this matter? But, of course, no cold water on it! We must do something even as a matter of self-defence. Talk it over as to what are the best means by which we can succeed. If agreeable and convenient to you, we might meet again this day week—anywhere you decide upon, if you will kindly let me know the place and time. Pray excuse me now. I have an appointment with His Grace at four o'clock."

A few minutes later the genial pastor had disappeared down the avenue, crossed the square, and stood at the door of the Archbishop's residence.

E. J. DEVINE, S.J.

Montreal, Canada.

(To be continued.)

AN IRISH IDEALIST.

(Concluded.)

BEFORE we come to consider Berkeley as a philosopher and compare him in that light with Malebranche, a few further glimpses of his character and attainments will be of interest. And first of all he must be classed among those specimens of extraordinary precocity who are called the "Marvellous Boys"

of Metaphysics. If Suarez was deep in scholasticism before he was twenty-four, and if Hume was a sceptic at the age of twenty-one, Berkeley was a convinced idealist at the age of nineteen. Very interesting evidence of this may be found in the wonderful note-book or commonplace-book which he kept as a student of Trinity College during the years 1705–7.[1] Professor Campbell Fraser, the great authority on Berkeley, says of this note-book: "It must be reckoned among the most precious records in existence of the crude solitary struggles of subtle philosophical genius. It enables us to watch Berkeley when he was awakening into intellectual life in company with Locke and Descartes and Malebranche. We find him gradually satisfying himself as to the reasonableness of our beliefs about ourselves and nature and God, by the help of a new thought which had occurred to him about the meaning of the word 'real' when applied to the things of sense. . . . Throughout these private utterings of his thoughts, fresh and earnestly real, written as they arose, one finds a mind everywhere laboring under the consciousness of a new world-transforming conception, the sense of which gives rise to successive flashes of speculative and moral enthusiasm."[2] "The reverse of my Principle," he says, "I take to be the chief source of all that scepticism and folly, all these contradictory and inexplicable puzzling absurdities that have in all ages been a reproach to human reason. I know there is a mighty sect of men who will oppose me. I am young, I am an upstart, I am vain, it will be said. Very well. I will endeavor patiently to bear up under the most lessening, vilifying appellations the pride and rage of man can devise. But one thing I know I am not guilty of—I do not pin my faith as the slave of any great man." The mighty sect of men that Berkeley complained of seemed to him to be merely mighty talkers, men who used words instead of ideas, who talked without making sure of any definite meaning, or indeed of any meaning at all. So "the chief thing I do or pretend to do is only to remove the mist and veil of words. This it is that has occasioned ignorance and confusion. This has ruined the schoolmen and mathematicians, the lawyers and divines."

[1] He was born March 12, 1685.

[2] Fraser's *Berkeley*, in "Blackwood's Philosophical Series."

This notion deprived Berkeley of all patience when he witnessed the performances of the atheists and freethinkers of his day. Although, as Hume pointed out, the most persuasive part of his polemic against matter and materialists is merely and purely sceptical in itself and in its consequences, yet he could not brook any scepticism in reference to the solemn truths of religion and morality. Indeed, this zeal for the highest and most sacred concerns of man, and not any devotion to speculation and theory for their own sake, was the mainspring of his ardor and the inspiration of his life-work. Like Newman, he is the champion of Truth, as it appeared to him, against the inroads of doubt and error; and he endeavored to construct a sort of philosophical *via media* between unbelief and "Popery."

And yet, like Newman too, he confesses that he "was distrustful at the age of eight, and so by nature disposed for the acceptance of the new doctrine of Idealism." In the very first pages of the *Apologia* we are told by Newman that, as a boy, "I used to think that life might be a dream or I an angel and all this world a delusion, my fellow-angels by a playful device concealing themselves from me and deceiving me with the semblance of a material world." The famous *Analogy* of Berkeley's great friend, Bishop Butler, only helped to extend and confirm those "childish imaginations" into a sort of philosophy of religion of which the "Sacramental Principle" is a leading tenet. "The very notion," says Newman, "that there is an analogy between the various works of God suggests that the system of lesser importance is economically or sacramentally subordinated to the more momentous system; and of this, the theory to which I was inclined as a boy, viz., the unreality of rational phenomena, is an ultimate resolution. At this time I did not make the distinction so necessary and so obvious in discussing the subject, between matter itself and its phenomena." Books so different as Keble's beautiful *Christian Year* and dry volumes of the school of Calvin combined to influence him in the same direction, "to confirm me in my mistrust in the reality of material things and to make me rest in the thought of two and two only absolute and luminously self-evident Beings, myself and my Creator." Yet all this time Newman knew nothing of Berkeley beyond the name.

Now while Berkeley was living the recluse life of a student in Rhode Island, awaiting the development of his Bermuda scheme, he became a fast friend of a man who bore a name that sorts but ill with anything visionary or foolish. This man was Samuel Johnson, afterwards president of King's College, New York. Johnson became an ardent convert to idealism and, says Professor Fraser, illustrated and applied to theology in his own *Elementa Philosophica*, published long afterwards, the lessons he had learned from Berkeley. "New England," continues the Professor, "possessed at this time the most subtle metaphysical reasoner that America has ever produced. Jonathan Edwards represents the genius of Puritan religion in the highest sphere of abstract thought, as Bunyan and Milton represent it in the world of creative imagination. Though he does not name Berkeley, his writings show that he adopted his conception of the material world and its laws." This famous Calvinistic thinker was one of Johnson's pupils at Yale College or living a life of devout meditation on the bank of the Hudson River when Berkeley was in Rhode Island. Edwards' *Freedom of the Will* did not appear until 1754. It is in his earlier writings that his metaphysical conclusions about matter are to be found. The "universal necessity" of Edwards was foreign to the thought of Berkeley, whose recognition of moral and therefore independent agency and power in finite spirits saved him from conclusions avowed by Spinoza and logically implied by Malebranche and the American Puritan. Edwards, however, defended the conclusion that the objects of our sensuous perceptions can have no actual and intelligible existence abstracted from the sense-experience of a spirit. How far Fraser's remark about the logical connection between Malebranche and Spinoza is justifiable and may be extended over to Berkeley as well, we shall inquire later on. Just now it is of interest to note the startling connection between two minds so fundamentally unlike as those of Newman and Edwards: the connecting links are supplied on the one hand by Berkeley and on the other by Calvin.

Berkeley's life-work, as has been noted, consisted in the application of all the resources and acquirements of a most wonderfully endowed mind to the defence of Christian faith and morals. Thus at first sight it is not easy to connect subjects so far apart as

homely tar-water on the one hand and the *rationale* of mathematics on the other, with the higher and deeper arcana of revelation. Yet read the paragraph in Father Sheehan's work that immediately precedes the story quoted at the head of the first part of this paper; a paragraph by the way which makes it still more difficult to justify the epithets already complained of.

Now in Berkeley's day one of the most famous wits of the reign of Queen Anne, Dr. Samuel Garth, lying on what threatened to become his death-bed, was reported to have spoken slightingly of the Christian mysteries as being deficient in clearness and definite meaning. This at once roused the master passion of Berkeley's soul. In his polemical ardor he adopted a method of apologetics which has since been made familiar by Mr. Balfour in his *Foundations of Belief* and *Defence of Philosophic Doubts.* He pointed out that if Christian revelation is replete with obscurities and seeming contradictions, the vaunted discoveries of human science when probed to the bottom are found to be none the less so. The wonderful Essay he wrote in this connection is called "The Analyst: or a Discourse addressed to an infidel mathematician; wherein it is examined whether the object, principles and inferences of the modern analysis are more distinctly conceived or more evidently deduced than religious mysteries and points of faith." It opens in characteristic and instructive style.

"Though I am a stranger to your person, yet I am not, Sir, a stranger to the reputation you have acquired in that branch of learning which hath been your peculiar study; nor to the authority you therefore assume in things foreign to your profession; nor to the abuse that you and too many more of like character are known to make of such undue authority to the misleading of unwary persons in matters of the higher concernment and whereof your mathematical knowledge can by no means qualify you to be a competent judge. Equity indeed and good sense would incline one to disregard the judgment of men in points which they have not considered or examined. But several who make the loudest claim to those qualities do nevertheless the very thing they would seem to despise, clothing themselves in the livery of other men's opinions and putting on a general deference for the judgment of you gentlemen, who are presumed to be of all men the greatest

masters of reason, to be most conversant about distinct ideas and never to take things upon trust, but always clearly to see your way as men whose constant employment is the deducing truth by the justest inference from the most evident principles. With this bias on their minds they submit to your decisions where you have no right to decide. And that this is one short way of making infidels, I am credibly informed."

He then proceeds to his very effective *argumentum ad hominem*, which is marred however by the shallow Nominalism which is after all, as he himself knew very well, the true and essential basis of Idealism. Yet there are many striking and effective points in the essay; as, for example, where "he points out in anticipation of Hegel that seeming inconsistency in the calculus of Newton which Carnot attempted to explain by a compensation of errors, which Lagrange endeavored to evade by his calculus of functions, and which Euler and D'Alembert could only obviate by pointing out the constant conformity of the mathematical conception with ascertained results."[3] This intrusion of the mere polemic divine into the sacred precincts of "science," whose votaries were even then endeavoring to purloin the "clothes of religion" and assume the dictatorial, *ex-cathedra* air which has since become so familiar to us all, involved Berkeley in a controversy as acrimonious and unedifying as had been the more famous debate on the same subject between Newton and Leibnitz and their respective followers. The infuriated Dons of Cambridge issued forth to battle from the traditional home of Mathematical Science in England; and our puny David confronted those Goliaths with his brief which he sarcastically called "A Defence of Freethinking in Mathematics."

The polemic of the *Analyst* however, admirable though it be as an *argumentum ad hominem*, is scarcely a safe method; for, says Newman in another connection, it is neither wise nor charitable to bluntly confront the average man with all his passions and prejudices about him with the harsh alternative, Christianity or utter scepticism. Indeed, a method akin to this in the hands of Dean Mansel turned out to be the very handbook of modern agnosticism; and the famous Bampton Lectures "On the Limits

[3] See the late Judge Webb's interesting Essay on Berkeley in his remarkable, though sceptical work, *The Veil of Isis*, Dublin University Press, 1885.

of Religious Thoughts" supplied copious and welcome extracts to the late Herbert Spencer.[4] Thus Huxley, for example, who deserved, if any man ever did, the plain speech which Berkeley addressed to Garth, would be little troubled by Berkeley's dilemma; and in fact could calmly write in his book on Hume: "For any demonstration that can be given to the contrary effect, the collection of perceptions which make up our consciousness may be an orderly phantasmagoria generated by the Ego unfolding its successive scenes on the background of the abyss of nothingness; as a firework, which is but cunningly arranged combustibles, grows from a spark into a corruscation, and from a corruscation into figures and words and cascades of devouring flame and then vanishes into the darkness of night." So difficult is it to catch and hold your slippery advocate of "clear ideas" and "accurate scientific thought;" for him any folly is preferable to the Gospel of Christ.

In these discussions at all events Berkeley proved himself a master of the mathematical learning of his day, and redeemed the promise of his youthful *Arithmetica* and *Miscellanea Mathematica*. Of those youthful works Fraser says: "Even in abstract science his impetuous temperament appears as well as his interest in the metaphysics of mathematics, and also that interest in what is novel and eccentric which is so apt to animate courageous beginners in a course of research." So too the *Siris;* crude and antiquated as it is, its main thesis yet shows him fully abreast of his time in all manner of physical and physiological science. Nothing from Aristotle and Galen to Boyle, Newton, and Descartes is unknown to this encyclopædic mind. "In his *Minute Philosopher* he shows himself master of the whole domain of speculation, and while tracking the free thought of the day through its various evolutions, exhibits an exquisite elegance of diction which is unsurpassed by Addison himself; and in that wonderful miscellany of physical hypothesis and metaphysical research which he denominated *Siris,* he seems to have been borne aloft into the very atmosphere of Plato and has given to the world of speculation a modern counterpart of the Parmerides and the Timaens."[5] In

[4] See Boedder's *Natural Theology*, Stonyhurst Series.

[5] Webb.

1709[6] he wrote from Trinity College a letter to Sir John Percival in which he refers with admiration to Plato, to the delight with which he read the Phædo and other dialogues years before, and to "the harmony of the Platonic spirit with the perfection and badge of Christianity which is its generous contempt for the things of this sentient life." His devotion to Plato was a lifelong passion. A noble passage in the *Siris*, written in his old age, deserves notice:

"It might very well be thought serious trifling to tell my readers that the greatest men had ever a high esteem for Plato; whose writings are the touchstone of a hasty and shallow mind; whose philosophy has been the admiration of ages; which supplied patriots, magistrates, and lawgivers to the most flourishing states as well as Fathers to the Church and Doctors to the Schools. Albeit in these days the depths of that old learning are rarely fathomed, and yet it were happy for these lands if our young nobility and gentry instead of modern maxims would imbibe the notions of the great men of antiquity. But in these freethinking times many an empty head is shook at Aristotle and Plato as well as at the Holy Scriptures. And the writings of these celebrated ancients are by most men treated on a foot with the dry and barbarous lucubrations of the schoolmen. It may be modestly presumed there are not many among us even of those who are called the better sort who have more sense, virtue and love of their country than Cicero, who in a letter to Athens could not forbear exclaiming 'O Socrates et Socratici viri! Numquam vobis gratiam referam!' Would to God many of our countrymen had the same obligations to these Socratic writers! Certainly where the people are well educated the art of piloting a state is best learned from the writings of Plato. But among bad men void of discipline and education, Plato, Pythagoras, and Aristotle themselves, were they living, could do but little good . . .[7] The displeasure of some readers may perhaps be incurred by surprising them into certain reflections and inquiries for which they have no curiosity. But perhaps some others may be pleased to find a dry subject varied by digressions, traced through remote inference and carried into ancient times whose hoary maxims scattered in this essay are not proposed as principles but barely as hints to awaken and exercise the inquisitive

[6] At age of twenty-four; he was born in 1685.

[7] P. 332.

reader on points not beneath the attention of the ablest men. Those great men, Pythagoras, Plato and Aristotle, the most consummate in politics, who founded states or instructed princes or wrote most accurately on public government, were at the same time the most acute at all abstracted and sublime speculations; the clearest light being ever necessary to guide the most important actions. And whatever the world thinks, he who hath not much meditated upon God, the human mind, and the *summum bonum* may possibly make a thriving earthworm but will most indubitably make a sorry patriot and a sorry statesman.''[8]

We may well regard Berkeley as the legitimate descendant of Cummian and Virgilias and Scotus Erigena and many another Irish scholar; whose native love and reverence for the wisdom of the past made them the seed-sowers and the founders of European civilization. Let us join with Berkeley in the wish and the hope that our people may ever cling to the "notions of the great men of antiquity," and that our gradually awakening interest in the old-time lore of Ireland may be fruitful in permanent benefit to our country and to the world.

What did the critics think of Berkeley's philosophy? "At first," says Webb, "the speculation that was to revolutionize the philosophy of Europe was received with the easy toleration of contempt. According to Swift, Berkeley made a proselyte of Smalridge and a few other people of position. But in the world in general he was assailed with the ridicule with which Pyrrho was mocked when he pursued his cook." Writing to Sir John Percival, then in London, during July of 1710, just after his *Treatise on the First Principles of Human Knowledge* had been published, Berkeley says: "If when you receive my book you can procure me the opinion of some of your acquaintances who are thinking men, addicted to the study of natural philosophy and mathematics, I shall be extremely obliged to you." Sir John's answer was not reassuring. "For I did but name the subject-matter of your book of Principles to some ingenious friends of mine and they immediately treated it with ridicule, at the same time refusing to read it. . . . A physician of my acquaintance undertook to describe your person and argued you must be mad

[8] P. 350.

and that you ought to take remedies. A bishop pitied you that a desire and vanity of starting something new should put you upon such an undertaking; and when I justified you in that part of your character and added other deserving qualities you have, he could not tell what to think of you. Another told me an ingenious man ought not to be discouraged from exercising his wit, and said Erasmus was not the worse thought of for writing in praise of folly; but that you are not so far gone as a gentleman in town who asserts not only that there is no such thing as matter, but we ourselves have no being at all. My wife, who has all the good esteem of you that is possible, desires to know, if there be nothing but Spirit and ideas, what you make of that part of the six days' creation that preceded man." Thus already his anticipation of "lessening and vilifying appellations" from "the mighty sect of men" are amply justified. Brown, the famous opponent of Shaftesbury, tells us in his *Essay on Satire* that "coxcombs refuted Berkeley with a grin." But the grin was not confined to coxcombs. Warburton laughed at the Idealist as a mere visionary. Arbuthnot could not suppress a sneer at "poor philosopher Berkeley," and described him to Swift as enjoying the idea of health after being brought to death's door by the idea of a fever. Voltaire said it was pleasant to think that ten thousand cannon balls and ten thousand dead men were only so many disagreeable ideas. Johnson looked on the whole ideal system as worthy of no better reputation than that supplied by his memorable kick. Beattie professed to regard the reference of everything to God as something atheistic. At the instance of Addison, Clarke, the great *a priori* philosopher of the age, met Berkeley in order to discuss the subject; but Berkeley complained that Clarke, though he could not answer him, had not the candor to own himself convinced. Clarke indeed, as we learn from another letter of Percival, ranked Berkeley with Malebranche and his great English disciple Norris, author of the memorable saying "Mind and matter are separated by the whole diametre of being"; extraordinary men no doubt, says Clarke, but their labors are of little use to mankind on account of their abstruseness.

Reid, head of the Scottish School, professed himself unable to understand the famous saying of Norris, and Hamilton united

an opposite site on the insular illiteracy, so characteristic of the British mind, which the confession implies.[9] Reid, however, also confesses: "If I may presume to speak my own sentiments, I once believed this doctrine of ideas so firmly as to embrace the whole of Berkeley's system in consequence of it; till finding other consequences to follow from it which gave me more uneasiness than the want of a material world, it came into my mind more than forty years ago to put the question,—'What evidence have I for this doctrine that all the objects of knowledge are ideas in my own mind?'" Recoiling from those consequences he took refuge in the "natural instinct" and "common sense" which another Irishman, Francis Hutcheson by name, had manufactured out of the sentimentalism of Shaftesbury; and recommends his quondam friend the idealist to run his head against a post and to be clapped into a madhouse for his pains. Berkeley, as we saw, was not so far gone as the man in London who held "that we ourselves have no existence," in whose view therefore the "Ego" of Huxley's supposition vanishes as well as mere matter, and the "phantasmagoria," the "fireworks," alone remain. This is one of the "other consequences" which Reid dreaded; and it confronted him with all manner of atheistic nihilism in the solemn travesty of philosophy that appeared in the youthful *Treatise* and the more mature *Inquiry* of David Hume.

Hume himself, after quoting Berkeley's quibble about abstract idea, says: "This argument is drawn from Dr. Berkeley; and indeed most of the writings of that very ingenious author form the best lessons of scepticism which are to be found either among the ancient or modern philosophers, Boyle not excepted. He professes, however, in his title-page (and undoubtedly with great truth) to have composed his book against the sceptics as well as against the atheists and freethinkers. But that all his arguments, though otherwise intended, are in reality merely sceptical appears from this *that they admit of no answer and produce no conviction.*[10] Their only effect is to cause that momentary amazement and irresolution and confusion which is the result of scepticism."[11]

[9] See Hamilton's *Reid.*

[10] Italics are Hume's own.

[11] *Inquiry*, Note M to Par. 1, Section XII.

Hume's criticism, says Judge Webb, supplies the true justification of Clarke in his refusal to own himself convinced. But Berkeley was destined to exercise upon human thought an influence far more powerful than any of his mocking contemporaries suspected. As we have just seen from Hume's own avowal, Berkeley was the arch-sceptic's teacher in scepticism; and as an exponent of agnosticism from the logical and philosophical side, Hume has never been excelled by any modern agnostic. Hume, moreover, gave occasion, as we also saw, to Reid to make those meditations that issued in the System of Common Sense; a system on behalf of which Father Sheehan writes some sympathetic words,[12] as also does Father Rickaby.[13] Indeed, if we only go over the list of names—Reid, Brown, Stewart, Hamilton, Veitch, and Knight, in Scotland; Mansel, in England; McCosh, in America and Ireland; Royer Collard, Jouffroy, and Cousin, in France—it will be manifest that the Scottish school represents the healthiest philosophical influence in the modern non-Catholic world. No doubt, it is the fashion among sublime and transcendental folk, admirers of those "comets of the outer darkness"—Kant and Fichte, Hegel and Schelling—to deride and ridicule the common-sense philosophers; to say that "natural instinct" in philosophy is likely to rival its performances in the china-shop of fable, that "common-sense" in metaphysics is common nonsense. Now, though we must acknowledge that there is a danger of "common-sense" in philosophy degenerating into another form of the shallow and vulgar "private judgment" of the sectaries, we must feel grateful to the Scottish thinkers and their followers for their healthy protest on behalf of human nature against the arrogant *ipse dixit* of the self-constituted pontiffs of philosophy—Hume, Kant, Fichte, Hegel. Each in turn calmly assured the world in so many words that its only work for the future would be to read and understand "my philosophy." Berkeley was pretty sure of the truth of his views. "Berkeley's confidence in his idealism, however," says Sir W. Hamilton, "was nothing to Fichte's. This philosopher in one of his controversial treatises imprecated everlasting damnation on himself not only should he retract, but

[12] *Under the Cedars and the Stars*, pp. 21–22.

[13] *First Principles*, Stonyhurst Series, p. 207.

should he even waver in regard to any one principle of his doctrine; a doctrine the speculative result of which left him, as he confesses, without even a certainty of his own existence! It is Varro who speaks of the *credula philosophorum ratio;* but this is to be credulous even in incredulity." Let us hear this extraordinary confession of Fichte. "The sum total," he says, "is this: There is absolutely nothing permanent, either within me or without me, but only an unceasing change. I know absolutely nothing of any existence, not even of my own. I myself know nothing and am nothing. Images there are; they constitute all that apparently exists, and what they know of themselves is after the manner of images; images that pass and vanish without there being aught to witness their transition; that consist in fact of the images of images, without significance and without an aim. I myself am one of these images; nay, I am not even thus much, but only a confused image of images. All reality is converted into a marvellous dream, without a life to dream of and without a mind to dream; into a dream made up only of a dream of itself. Perception is a dream; thought, the source of all the existence and all the reality which I imagine to myself of my existence, of my power, of my destination, is the dream of that dream." Thus does the arrogant disciple of Kant accept the supposition of Huxley as the final result of philosophy. And although it was Berkeley that set speculation moving in the direction of this abyss, by his idealistic scepticism and his advocacy of the relativity of knowledge, yet his appeal to the plain, unvarnished sense of ordinary men of the world was in all likelihood the source of the Scottish reaction toward health and sanity.

Indeed if we inquire where Reid got the hint that common sense might serve as a *locus philosophicus* and a topic for the schools, although our choice must needs lie between two Irishmen, the credit seems to belong to Berkeley rather than to Hutcheson. Reid is careful to point out how artfully Berkeley tries to win common men to his views by speaking as they speak. In the "Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous," the latter speaking for the author says to honest Hylas (Dial. I): "I entirely agree with you as to the ill tendency of the affected doubts of some philosophers and fantastical conceits of others. I

am even so far gone of late in this way of thinking that I have quitted the sublime notions I got in their schools for vulgar opinions. And I give it you on my word since this *revolt from metaphysical notions to the plain dictates of nature and common sense*, I find my understanding strangely enlightened so that I can now easily comprehend a great many things which before were all mystery and riddle." Reid suggests that in all this there is little more than a device to conciliate the mighty "sect of men" dreaded by the youthful author; and indeed Berkeley had reminded himself in his college notebook, "that he that would bring another to his own opinion must seem to harmonize with him at first and humor him in his way of talking."[14] But Reid's own procedure was an improvement upon that of Berkeley merely in so far as he was more cautious and less adventurous in consulting "common-sense" than was the master who sent him to that oracle.

Yet though we must in charity admit that the sober thinkers of Scotland owe something to Berkeley, we must also allow his great influence in the extraordinary metaphysical mania of Germany. Hume taught by him roused Kant from his dogmatic slumber, and stimulated him to the effort to save philosophy from the reproach of absolute helplessness levelled at it by the great Scottish sceptic. Now the Irish critic already quoted, the late Judge Webb, is of opinion that Kant did little more than convert the plain English of Hume into most obscure sesquipedalian German. Perhaps a similar remark may hold true to some extent about Huxley and Spencer and Matthew Arnold. To sum up in the words of Judge Webb: "It is scarcely too much to say with Hamann that without Berkeley there would have been no Hume, as without Hume there would have been no Kant, and as without Kant there would have been no Hegel." As a set-off to this somewhat equivocal praise let us bear in mind how our Idealist is connected with the Scottish school; let us also turn once more to his relations with the great leader of the Oxford Movement.

Newman is indeed a tempting subject. In 1839, he wrote an article (in the *British Critic*) "which best describes my state of mind at that period." Quoting from it in the *Apologia* he says:

[14] Fraser, p. 13.

"I spoke of Coleridge thus: 'While history in prose and verse was then (by Scott) made the instrument of church feelings and opinions, a philosophical basis for the same was laid in England by a very original thinker, who while he indulged in a liberty of speculation which no Christian can tolerate and advocated conclusions which were often heathen rather than Christian, yet after all installed a higher philosophy into inquiring minds than they had hitherto been accustomed to accept. In this way he made trial of his age and succeeded in interesting its genius in the cause of Catholic truth." Now the "logician, metaphysician, bard" of Lamb's enthusiastic panegyric wrote among other things an *Apologia* of his own, his *Biographia Literaria.* In the ninth chapter of that curious work he says: "After I had successively studied in the schools of Locke, Berkeley, Leibnitz and Hartley and could find in neither of them an abiding place for my reason, I began to ask myself,—Is a system of philosophy, as different from mere history and historic classification, possible?" And he almost lapsed into scepticism. From this he says he was rescued first by the so-called mystics, Jacob Behmen, George Fox, and William Law, but secondly and chiefly by the works of Kant: "The writings of the illustrious sage of Königsberg at once invigorated and disciplined my understanding. The originality, the depth, and the compression of the thoughts; the novelty and subtlety, yet solidity and importance, of the distinctions; the adamantine chain of logic; and I will venture to add (paradox as it will appear to those who have taken their notion of Emmanuel Kant from Reviewers and Frenchmen), the clearness and evidence of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, etc., took possession of me with a giant's hand. After fifteen years' familiarity with them I still read these and all his other productions with undiminished delight and increasing admiration." He thinks too that Kant had an esoteric philosophy in his mind which he was afraid to make known to the public, except by vague symbolical hints scattered through his writings;—"and for those who could not break through this symbolical husk his writings were not intended." He goes on to defend this "prudest economy" in teaching the deeper arcana of philosophy, before he proceeds to apply some of those supposed principles in labored apology for Wordsworth

and the Lake school of poetry. It is interesting at all events to know that Kant was with the mystics "a pillar of fire throughout the night during my wanderings through the wilderness of doubt, and enabled me to skirt without crossing the sandy deserts of utter unbelief." And thus once more through Hume and Kant and Coleridge is Berkeley connected with the great movement that is identified with the name of Oxford where Berkeley died and lies interred, and Newman, the greatest mind that Oxford has produced since the days of Albert and Duns Scotus.

A wag, perhaps it was Dean Swift said, "Berkeley says there is no matter; it is no matter what Berkeley says." Hume showed that there was a good deal of truth in the witticism: "The words with which M. Simon closes his Introduction to his edition of the works of Malebranche are equally applicable to Berkeley who, notwithstanding the vast stimulus which he has given to speculation, has been assailed by the same shallow wit which said of Malebranche:

'He who in God sees all things pass,
Sees he not then that he's an ass?'

"Un méchant vers de Faydit—

'Lui qui voit tout en Dieu
N'y voit pas qu'il est fou?—

eut une fortune immense. Il est si commode pour le vulgaire de se débarrasser du fardeau de l'admiration et d'avoir pitié des hommes de génée! Ce fou de Malebranche est une de nos grandes gloires nationales; ses visions métaphysiques sont une école de sagesse et de profonde philosophie et plaise à Dieu pour l'honneur de la philosophie et le progrès de l'esprit humain qu'il nous puisse naitre encore des réveurs comme lui.[15]"

P. FORDE.

Summerhill, Ireland.

[15] Webb.

THE SYMPTOMS OF DEATH AS A CONDITION FOR ADMINISTERING THE LAST SACRAMENTS.

A Physiologico-Theological Study.

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION.—Some time ago Father Ferreres, S.J., Professor of Moral Theology in the principal Jesuit College at Tortosa (Spain), author of several works on the subject of Moral Theology and Canon Law,[1] published a treatise[2] on the above-named subject which created much attention and discussion, not only in the theological but also in the medical circles of Spain. Soon the subject was taken up by different Italian, French, and German writers,[3] and translations appeared in these languages which elicited equal interest in other countries. Thus far the treatise has not been made accessible to English readers, and it remains for us, now that the subject has received from its author what might be called the "ultima castigatio ad unguem," to present it to our readers, in the hope that it will add considerably to the understanding of a matter which is of great moment to the pastor of souls, and which should therefore be thoroughly mastered by every priest on the mission.

For the English translation of the work we owe thanks to a Jesuit Father of our St. Louis University, who has retained as far as desirable the original train of thought and expression which, since the matter is somewhat technical, is the only course open to the translator.

We pass over the extensive medico-theological literature which Father Ferreres cites as his literary sources; but it will be of advantage to the student to get a general survey of the topics here treated before we enter upon the detailed analysis of the subject.

After dwelling briefly upon the importance of the question and referring to the critical discussion and study of the subject by

[1] *Compendium Theologiae Moralis*, Gury-Ferreres; *Casus Conscientiae*, Gury-Ferreres; *El Impedimento de Clandestinidad*, etc.

[2] See *Razon y Fe*, revista mensual. Madrid, tomo IX–X.

[3] See *Il Monitore Ecclesiastico*, Roma; *Revue Augustinienne*, Louvain-Paris; *Revue Theologique Française*, Toulouse; *Études*, Paris; *Revista Ecclesiastica*, Buenos Ayres; *Pastoral Blatt*, St. Louis; etc.

the Professors of the Academia of SS. Cosmas and Damian, in Barcelona, the author takes up the administration of Baptism to fœtuses and newly-born infants when in condition of apparent death.

I. What moral theology says on the subject of fœtus and infant baptism.

II. Medico-physiological teaching on continued vitality of the fœtus or the infant, when life is supposed to have become extinct.

III. Remarkable instances corroborating the foregoing teaching of physicians.

IV. Practical conclusions; followed by some important observations on the subject discussed.

Next the author deals with the administration of the Sacraments to adults who probably still live, though apparently and in common estimation dead.

I. Possibility of saving, through the administration of the Sacraments, the souls of adults apparently dead.

II. As long as there is a reasonable doubt, however slight, as to whether a man is alive or dead, the Sacraments may and should be administered to him.

III. Between the moment ordinarily held to be that of death and the actual moment at which death takes place, there is, probably in every case, a longer or shorter interval of "latent life," during which the Sacraments may be administered.

IV. Apart from positive marks of decomposition and a certain rigidity observable only in the dead there are no absolutely certain signs that indicate death.

V. In cases of sudden death the period of latent life probably continues until the first symptoms of decomposition set in.

VI. It may be assumed that in the case of those who die of a long sickness there is a remnant of life after apparent death has set in:

(*a*) for at least half an hour; and probably

(*b*) for a considerably longer period.

The author cites a number of instances to show that this period is much longer.

VII. During the probable period of latent life the priest may and should administer to adults, not only the Sacrament of Penance, but also and preferably that of Extreme Unction.

In conclusion Father Ferreres points out a practical method of reviving persons apparently dead, which consists in certain rhythmic tractions of the tongue, first suggested by Dr. Laborde, from whom the method takes its name. The author also gives some useful hints in regard to the probabilities and frequency of premature burial, and explains the use of a certain instrument called *Karnice* which makes it possible for a person buried alive to communicate his revival to someone outside.

DEATH—REAL AND APPARENT.

I.—Importance of the Subject.

THE question, at what precise moment death actually sets in and what are the unfailing symptoms which announce the separation of the soul from the body, is of great moment both to the physician and the priest. It not only involves the possibility at times of restoring temporal life, but in many cases affects the eternal salvation of the soul.

The problem is not new. Fr. Lacroix in the seventeenth century speaks of it in his treatise on moral theology, and during the following century it became the subject of *ex professo* discussion by the scholarly Spanish Benedictine, Father Feijoo; but it was reserved to modern medical science to investigate the subject more accurately. The result of numerous practical and scientific experiments has led medical men to the conclusion that life often, perhaps nearly always, continues after death, according to the ordinary criteria, is supposed to have set in.

Now if the germ of life under such circumstances of seeming death is maintained, it follows not only that by the use of various methods of resuscitation invented in our day, the salvation of a soul may be secured, but that the bodily life may be prolonged and improved.

Hitherto it has been customary to pronounce a person dead, and accordingly to relinquish all further efforts to sustain life, as soon as the ordinary symptoms indicating a cessation of vital action have appeared. After that instant no further effort was made to administer the Sacraments, or to restore the breath of

life which may have been extinct only in appearance. As a result of modern investigation greater care is being exercised in this respect, and consequently many persons thought to be dead have been saved from death.

It is the province ordinarily of the physician to ascertain by resuscitative methods whether death is apparent only or real. The priest's function turns rather upon the duty of saving souls by administering to those seemingly dead, yet still in possession of vital force, the Sacraments of the Church.

II.—Investigation by the Medical Society of Barcelona.

A few years ago an article published in the review *Études Franciscaines* by Dr. Coutenot, and later reproduced in the Manila daily *Libertas*, edited by the Dominican Fathers, brought the subject of this paper to the notice of the present writer, who was consulted upon certain phases connected with the same.

Realizing the importance and the difficulty of the subject, which involved not merely a moral but also a medical and physiological issue, I deemed it my duty to solicit an opinion in the case from some medical experts. Accordingly I applied to the Medico-Pharmaceutical Society of SS. Cosmas and Damian, a learned Catholic body of Barcelona, availing myself particularly of the kind services of the well-known expert in medico-electrical science, Dr. D. Luis Cirera y Sales, who is likewise President of the Publishing Board of *El Criterio Católico en las Ciencias Médicas*, the organ of the aforesaid Society.

As might have been expected, the Society took up the investigation of the matter with cordial interest, and Dr. D. José Blanc y Benet, Secretary of the Publishing Board of *El Criterio Católico*, a physician of high rank, was chosen to conduct the discussion in the Academic department of the Society. During the four sessions devoted to the exposition of the subject, Dr. Blanc characterized it as one of eminent importance, claiming their careful attention. The conclusion of the discussion, participated in by the leading members of the Academy, was formulated in the following proposition by Dr. Blanc, to wit: "It may be accepted as a general thesis that *the death of a person does not occur at the instant*

judged, according to popular notions, to be the last of life, but some time after."[4]

In the session of January 15, 1903, Dr. Blanc was requested to make a summary report of the practical conclusions to which the meetings had led. This was done in a session of January 29th. The report consisted of sixteen conclusions voted upon by the members of the Academy who had taken part in the discussion.[5]

The dissertation and conclusions, together with the minutes of the sessions, were published in *El Criterio Católico en las Ciencias Médicas* (May to August, 1903). These have served me as a basis for further study of the question in hand. They are embodied in the present paper, and also in the *Casus* recently published by me.[6]

In the next article the administration of Baptism given to a fœtus or to newly-born infants apparently dead will be discussed.

P. JUAN FERRERES, S.J.

Tortosa, Spain.

[4] In the first two sessions a full exposition of the subject, with the issues involved, was given by Dr. Blanc, who spoke with characteristic solidity and erudition. In the third and fourth sessions the discussion was taken up by Drs. Cirera, Grau y Marti, Ruiz Contreras, Bassols y Prim, Ribas y Perdigo, and Nubiola, President of the Academy, Dr. Anguera, all of whom confirmed the diagnosis of Dr. Blanc, and added their testimony to "his thorough treatment of so important a subject." (Minutes of the session for January 29, 1903.)

[5] The better to appreciate the value of this endorsement on the part of the Academy, we give the names of the physicians present and voting at the above-mentioned session: Doctors D. José Anguera y Cailá, D. Luis Cirera y Salse, D. Isidro Pujador y Faura, D. Juan Rovira y Vendrell, D. Hermenegildo Puig y Sais, D. Lino Jorda y Batiller, D. Juan Ribas y Perdigó, D. Joaquin de la Riba, D. José Boniquet y Colomer, D. Antonio Gatell, D. Alejo Civil y Bugoñá, D. Eusebio Grau y Martı, D. Pedro Nubiola y Espinós, D. José Ruiz y Contreras, D. José Blanc y Benet, D. Pelayo Fontsará, D. Agustin Bassols y Prim, D. José A. Masip.

[6] Gury-Ferreres: *Casus Conscientiae.* Barcinone; 1903. (See end of Vol. II.)

Analecta.

E COMMISSIONE PONTIFICIA PRO STUDIIS S. SCRIPTURAE PROVEHENDIS.

ORDO PERICULI SUBACTI PRO PROLYTATUS GRADU IN S. SCRIPTURA ANNO 1905.

1° *Periculum* habitum in Aedibus Vaticanis, a die 5ª ad 10ᵃᵐ mensis Iunii.

2° In experimento *scripto:*

Die 5 Iunii, feria IIª, ab hora 8ª a.m. ad horam 2ᵃᵐ p.m.: "*Specimen Exegeseos.*"

Die 6 Iunii, feria IIIª, ab hora 8ª ad 11ᵃᵐ a.m.: "*Specimen Historiae Biblicae.*"

Eodem die ab hora 4ª ad horam 7ᵃᵐ p.m.: "*Specimen Introductionis Generalis et Specialis in S. Scripturam.*"

3° Experimentum *verbale.*

Die 7 Iunii, feria IVª, ab hora 8ª a.m. ad horam 11ᵃᵐ, et versabitur circa; (*a*) *Introductionem Generalem—et* (*b*) *Introductionem Specialem in S. Scripturam;*—(*c*) *Historiam Biblicam;*—(*d*) *Linguam Hebraicam;*—(*e*) *Linguam Graecam.*

De mandato Pat. Suae Rmae

Fr. AUGUSTINUS MOLLINI, O. F. M.,

Subsecretarius.

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

I.

PLURES IN EADEM ECCLESIA CONSTITUI POSSUNT CONGREGATIONES SAECULARIS III ORDINIS S. FRANCISCI, PROPTER DIVERSAS SODALIUM NATIONES.

Beatissime Pater:

Minister Provincialis Ordinis Fratrum Minorum, in regulari Provincia Immaculatae Conceptionis apud Rempublicam Brasiliensem commorantium, praevio sacrorum pedum osculo, humillime Sanctitati Tuae exponit, apud unam eamdemque Ecclesiam Conventui Fratrum Minorum adnexam, et maxime, in Dioecesi Curitybensi, exstare quatuor Congregationes, vel plures paucioresve, Tertii Ordinis Saecularis Sancti Francisci, propter diversas Sodalium nationes, ita ut unaquaeque habeat suos ab invicem independentes officiales, proprios coetus, sub proprio Directore spirituali. Inde quaerit:

I. Utrum liceat eiusmodi diversas Congregationes in una eademque Ecclesia, sive in iisdem sive in diversis Ecclesiae Cappellis habere?

II. Utrum sic Indulgentias lucrari valeant Confratres, qui ad diversas eiusmodi pertinent Congregationes?

Et Deus, etc.

Sacra Congregatio Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita declarat: Nihil obstare, quominus Sodalium Tertii Ordinis Saecularis Sancti Francisci Congregationes constituantur, prout exponitur, simulque gaudeant Indulgentiis aliisque spiritualibus gratiis et privilegiis ipsis concessis.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria eiusdem Sacrae Congregationis die 8 Martii 1905.

IOSEPHUS M. Can. COSELLI, *Substitutus.*

L. † S.

II.

DECRETUM DE INDULGENTIIS LUCRANDIS IN SACELLIS SIVE PUBLICIS SIVE SEMI-PUBLICIS TERTIARIORUM IN COMMUNITATE VIVENTIUM ET VOTA SIMPLICIA NUNCUPANTIUM.

Quum per Decretum Sacrae Congregationis Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae, sub die 28 Augusti 1903 conces-

sum sit, ut Tertiariorum Ecclesiae iisdem Indulgentiis gaudeant, quibus Ecclesiae respectivi primi et secundi Ordinis fruuntur, quaesitum est ab hac Sacra Congregatione :

" Num quando agitur de lucrandis praefatis Indulgentiis sub nomine *Ecclesiae* Tertiariorum veniant non solum Oratoria publica, sed etiam semipublica, in quibus, ex Decreto Sacrae Rituum Congregationis, diei 23 Ianuarii 1899, non modo qui sunt de Communitate, sed alii etiam Christifideles satisfacere queunt diebus festis praecepto audiendi Sacrum ?"

Et Sacra Congregatio, audito etiam Consultorum voto, respondendum mandavit :

" Negative ; et supplicandum Sanctissimo, ut benigne extendere dignetur etiam ad Oratoria semipublica Tertiariorum privilegium lucrandi Indulgentias, de quibus, in casu, sed favore tantum eorumdem Tertiariorum caeterarumque personarum cum ipsis in Communitate degentium.[1]"

De quibus facta relatione Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Pio Papae X, in Audientia habita die 22 Martii 1905, ab infrascripto Cardinali Praefecto, eadem Sanctitas Sua resolutionem Sacrae Congregationis benigne confirmavit, simulque petitam extensionem concessit.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria eiusdem Sacrae Congregationis die 22 Martii 1905.

A. *Card.* Tripepi, *Pro-Praef.*

L. † S.

† D. Panici, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

III.

Sodalibus Sancti et Immaculati Cordis Mariae, sive publice sive privatim, pium exercitium peragentibus, indulgentiae conceduntur semel in mense.

Plures extant per Catholicum Orbem diffusae piae sodalitates sub titulo sancti et immaculati Cordis Mariae, quae peculiarem

[1] Rescriptum tamen istud minime censetur pro Oratoriis semipublicis suffragari, si Ecclesia vel Oratorium publicum Domibus Tertii Ordinis Regularis adnexa reperiatur ; et his etiam deficientibus, pro uno Oratorio tantum seu principali favet, in quo et solae Tertii Coetus regularis quorumcumque Ordinum Personae vel Alumni et contubernales, ne religiosa unquam disciplina laedatur, Indulgentias Ecclesiarum respectivi I ac II Ordinis proprias valent obtinere. (*Ex Actis Ord. Min.*)

finem sibi praestituunt, deprecandi Beatam Virginem pro conversione peccatorum. Immo apud quasdam earum etiam laudabilis praxis inolevit semel in mense coadunandi Christifideles in propriam ecclesiam vel publicum oratorium, ut per unius horae spatium ferventiores effundant preces Deiparae Virgini ad eundem finem instantius assequendum. Cui quidem pietatis exercitio magis fovendo s. m. Pius IX indulgentias, tum plenarias, tum partiales per Apostolicas Literas datas sub die 12 Maii 1876 adnexuit.

Modo vero ad religionis incrementum et ad animarum salutem validius obtinendam SSmo Dno N.ro Pio Papae X, preces humillime porrectae sunt, ut ad praefatum pium exercitium, sive publice in ecclesiis illud locum habeat, sive privatim a quolibet ex Christifidelibus peragatur, easdem indulgentias benigne extendere dignetur.

Porro Sanctitas Sua, cui nihil potius est, quam ut Christifideles, opitulante immaculata Virgine Dei Matre, a Divina Bonitate obtineant, ut homines e via perditionis ad salutis tramitem reducantur, has preces peramanter excepit, et in Audientia habita die 12 Aprilis 1905 ab infrascripto Cardinali Praefecto S. C. Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae, sequentes indulgentias semel in mense lucrandas, in perpetuum clementer elargita est, nimirum; 1° plenariam Christifidelibus, qui supramemorato exercitio in ecclesiis seu publicis oratoriis peracto iuxta methodum ab Ordinariis locorum approbandam devote adstiterint, vel etiam privatim eidem piis exercitationibus cuiusque arbitrio relictis vacaverint, simulque uno, quo cuique placeat, infra mensem die, rite confessi ac S. Synaxi refecti, in Ecclesia vel publico sacello iuxta mentem eiusdem Sanctitatis Suae oraverint; 2° septem annorum totidemque quadragenarum eisdem Christifidelibus si, corde saltem contriti, supradicta pietatis opera praestiterint. Quas indulgentias eadem Sanctitas Sua animabus igne Purgatorii detentis fore applicabiles declaravit. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria eiusdem Sacrae Congregationis, die 14 Aprilis 1905.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Pro-Praef.*

L. ✝ S.

Pro R. P. D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*
IOSEPHUS M. *Cancus* COSELLI, *Subst.*

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

I.

Ord. Minorum Capuccinorum.

PRO ABSOLUTIONE GENERALI POST SACRAMENTALEM ABSOLUTIONEM, FORMULAM BREVIOREM ADHIBERI POSSE CONCEDITUR.

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius Papa X, clementer deferens humillimis precibus R.mi Patris Procuratoris Generalis Ordinis Minorum Capuccinorum, ab infrascripto Cardinali Sacrorum Rituum Congregationi Pro-Praefecto relatis, benigne indulgere dignatus est, ut in Absolutione Generali modo privato, id est immediate post sacramentalem Absolutionem a Regularibus impertienda, adhiberi valeat formula brevior, quae pro Tertiariis Saecularibus concessa fuit.[1] Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Die 22 Martii 1905.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Pro-Praef.*

L. † S. † D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

II.

INDULTUM PRO SACERDOTIBUS SAECULARIBUS III ORD. S. FR. DICENDI MISSAM VOTIVAM DE IMM. SINGULIS SABBATIS.

Cupiens Reverendissimus Pater Frater Bonaventura Marrani, Procurator Generalis Ordinis Minorum, ut cultus erga Imm. Deiparae Virginis Conceptionem magis magisque augeatur, atque omnis controversia tollatur circa Missam votivam de eadem Imm. Conc. ex Apostolicae Sedis Indulto concessam Franciscalibus

[1] Formula pro Tertiariis saecularibus adhibenda ita determinatur in Caeremoniali Tertii Ordinis: "*Si haec indulgentia immediate post sacramentalem absolutionem impertiatur, reliquis omissis, Sacerdos absolute incipiat a verbis:* 'Dominus noster Iesus Christus, etc.' et ita prosequatur usque ad finem, plurali tantum numero in singularem immutato." *En illa formula:* "Dominus noster Iesus Christus, qui beato Petro Apostolo dedit potestatem ligandi atque solvendi, ille te absolvat ab omni vinculo delictorum, ut habeas vitam aeternam, et vivas in saecula saeculorum. Amen. —Per sacratissimam passionem et mortem D. N. I. C., precibus et meritis beatissimae Virginis Mariae, beatorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, beati Patris nostri Francisci, et omnium Sanctorum, auctoritate a Summis Pontificibus mihi concessa, Plenariam Indulgentiam omnium peccatorum tuorum tibi impertior. In nomine Patris et Filii † et Spiritus Sancti. Amen."—Caeremoniale pergit: "*Si adiuncta vetent integram adhibere formulam, Sacerdos, reliquis omissis, dicere poterit:* 'Auctoritate a Summis Pontificibus mihi concessa, Plenariam peccatorum tuorum Indulgentiam tibi impertior. In nomine Patris et Filii † et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.'"

Familiis, a Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Pio Papa X humillimis precibus flagitavit:

I. Ut Sacerdotes etiam saeculares, Tertio Ordini Sancti Francisci adscripti, qui Kalendario Romano-Seraphico utuntur, quoties vel in privato Oratorio vel in Ecclesiis trium Ordinum Sancti Francisci Sacrum faciant, singulis per annum Sabbatis Missam votivam de Immaculata Beatae Mariae Virginis Conceptione legere valeant, prouti Alumnis vel Cappellanis trium Ordinum Regularium permittitur; quemadmodum nempe Sacerdotibus Tertii Ordinis Praedicatorum conceditur Feria IV et Sabbato per annum, etiam Festo duplici minori ac maiori impeditis, Missam Sanctissimi Rosarii "*Salve radix*" iisdem in casibus celebrare.[2]

II. Ut Sacerdotes e primo ac Tertio Ordine Regulari Sancti Francisci Sacrum facturi in Oratoriis privatis extra Coenobium positis, sicuti Kalendarium Romano-Seraphicum possunt ac debent adhibere, ita valeant Missam votivam de Immaculata Beatae Mariae Virginis Conceptione celebrare, prouti in Ecclesiis ipsius Ordinis conceditur; ne secus, ac praesertim Religiosi extra Coenobium rem divinam oblaturi, eodem uti privilegio impediantur, ipsis admodum salutari.

Sanctitas porro Sua, referente infrascripto Cardinali Sacrorum Rituum Congregationi Pro-Praefecto, benigne annuere dignata est pro gratia iuxta preces: servatis Rubricis. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 22 Martii 1905.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Pro-Praef.*

L. † S. † D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

III.

CIRCA USUM MUSICORUM INSTRUMENTORUM IN SACRIS FUNCTIONIBUS.

E.mus et R.mus D.nus Cardinalis Iosephus M. de Herrera y de la Iglesia, Archiepiscopus Compostellanus, ad Sacram Rituum Congregationem mittens elenchum tum festorum, quae in sua ecclesia Cathedrali solemniter celebrantur cum musica vocali et

[2] Indultum praesens valet etiam de Ecclesiis ad Tertium Ordinem *saecularem* Sancti Patris Nostri Francisci reapse pertinentibus, si in eis Kalendarium Romano-Seraphicum observetur, etiamque vim habet pro Vigilia proque integra Octava Immaculatae Conceptionis.

instrumentali, vulgo *orquesta;* tum instrumentorum, quibus musici utuntur in iisdem solemnitatibus: atque insuper interpretationem authenticam habere desiderans super iis, quae Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius Papa X in *Motu proprio* super musica sacra statuit nempe: "Aliquoties, servatis servandis, admitti possunt alia musica instrumenta, sed annuente Episcopo, ut Caeremoniale Episcoporum praecipit," eidem Sacrae Congregationi sequentia dubia enodanda reverenter proposuit, videlicet:

I. An, et in quibus festis permitti possit usus instrumentorum, quae (vulgo *violines, violas, violoncello, contrabajo, flauta, clarinetes, fagots, trompas*) in elencho recensentur?

II. An permitti possit usus instrumentorum in Officio et Missa defunctorum?

III. An proscribendus sit in ecclesiis parochialibus et conventualibus usus organi dicti *harmonium* in Officio et Missa defunctorum?

Sacra porro rituum Congregatio ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, exquisito voto Commissionis super Musica et Cantu sacro rescribendum censuit:

Ad I. Ad primam partem *Affirmative;* ad secundam partem, in illis functionibus et temporibus, in quibus sonus organi aliorumque instrumentorum non prohibetur a Caeremoniali Episcoporum, a praedicto *Motu proprio* et a Decretis S. R. C. uti in *Pisana* 20 Martii 1903, et in *Compostellana* 8 Ianuarii 1904, super Triduo Maioris Hebdomadae; verum iuxta prudens Ordinarii arbitrium in singulis casibus cum dispensatione a lege et praxi communi adhibendi in sacris functionibus cantum gregorianum vel musicam polyphonicam aut aliam probatam.

Ad II. In Officio *Negative;* in Missa et Absolutione post Missam, prouti in responso ad I et servatis servandis, ita ut sonus organi aliorumque instrumentorum tantum ad sustinendas voces adhibeatur, et sileant instrumenta cum silet cantus, iuxta Caeremoniale Episcoporum, lib. I, cap. 28, n. 13.

Ad III. Provisum in praecedenti.

Atque ita rescripsit, die 15 Aprilis 1905.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Pro-Praef.*

L. † S.

† D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:—

THE PONTIFICAL COMMISSION FOR SCRIPTURE STUDIES publishes the programme of examinations held in the early part of June for the initial academic degree in Biblical Science.

THE S. CONGREGATION OF INDULGENCES:

1. Permits the establishment in the same church of several congregations of Tertiaries belonging to different nationalities.

2. Extends the privileges of Indulgences accorded to churches of Tertiaries likewise to their public and semi-public chapels, unless these are merely attached to the principal church.

3. Extends the Indulgences accorded to members of the Sodality of the Immaculate Heart practising monthly pious exercises for the conversion of sinners, to all others who separately, in public or in private, perform the same devotions.

THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES:

1. Permits regulars to make use of the short form of absolution for the imparting of the Plenary Indulgence which secular priests who are Tertiaries of St. Francis (Ord. Min. Capuc.) are privileged to use.

2. Grants an Indult to secular priests of the Third Order of St. Francis who follow the seraphic Calendar, to say the Votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception on all Saturdays, including doubles minor and major, according to the Franciscan *Ordo*.

3. Explains that the use of orchestral music is permitted on solemn feasts and even in Requiem Masses and Offices, provided the music rendered is of the prescribed order indicated by the *Motu propio*,—that is to say, Gregorian or approved polyphonic music. The use of orchestral accompaniment is to be restricted to such liturgical chant as in general permits organ accompaniment. For the rest, the use of the harmonium during Office and

Mass for the Dead is also permitted, when it is intended to sustain the voices; but save as an accompaniment of the singing the organ (or harmonium) is not to be played at the Requiem services.

BISHOP BELLORD AND THE DISCUSSION REGARDING THE NOTION OF SACRIFICE.

It is with deep regret that we record here the death of the Right Reverend James Bellord, Bishop of Milevis, and formerly Vicar Apostolic of Gibraltar, which occurred at Nazareth House, Southend (England), on June 11th.

Bishop Bellord had for many years labored with admirable zeal for the propagation and defence of religion as a missionary, in the army, and in the literary field. He realized what has been so much emphasized recently by our Holy Father Pius X, the necessity of thorough catechetical instruction to our youth and to converts, in order that faith and morals may be preserved amid the dangers of a sceptical and self-indulgent age, intolerant of authority and dogma. For this he worked incessantly. His *Catechism*, his *Meditations on Christian Dogma*, his various studies touching the *Blessed Eucharist* as a doctrine based upon Scriptural teaching, and especially his latest articles in these pages, show a mind keen and critically aggressive, albeit devoutly loyal to the justly established traditions of the Church.

It was from his bed of sickness that he sent to us the two articles of which the first appeared in our last issue. The second we have reserved for the September number, partly because we wish thus to show our respect for the dead, partly also in deference to the wishes of those eminent theologians who have signified their intention of discussing the question raised by the deceased prelate, and who will be more at liberty to do so after the summer vacation.

In the meantime the advance sheets of the articles have been sent to some professors of dogmatic theology in order that full justice may be done to the theme in our pages.

Bishop Bellord, although conscious at the time he sent us the articles that he might soon be called hence, had hoped to see the matter in print, and to be able to learn the views of others upon

it. We had it, therefore, put in type at once, and sent him the copies. One of his last acts, as we are informed by the Rev. executor of the Bishop, was to invite the priests of the Essex Clerical Conference to assemble at his house to discuss the paper. This was done, but the Bishop was too weak to do more than assist in person and listen to the reading and comment. *R. I. P.*

The subject will be taken up again in our next issue (September), by the publication of Bishop Bellord's second article, which contains the principal gist of his argument in favor of what he himself styles the "Banquet Theory." In the same number, or the one immediately succeeding, we hope to have the criticism of the Rev. Augustine Lehmkuhl, S.J. (Valkenberg, Holland), Thomas Slater, S.J. (St. Beuno's College, England), and other leading writers in Germany, France, Italy, and Spain.

AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER OF THE VEN. BISHOP NEUMANN, C.SS.R.

During a recent search in the archives of the American College at Louvain (Belgium) the Vice-Rector of that institution, the Rev. Peter Masson, came upon an autograph letter of the Venerable John Nep. Neumann, late Bishop of Philadelphia, which he kindly placed at our disposal.

The letter, which we reproduce in *facsimile*, is of importance not only as coming from a prelate whose remarkable gifts of mind and heart have caused him to be proposed for canonization in Rome, but also because it throws definite light upon the attitude of the American bishops toward the project of founding a Belgian Seminary for the American missions, and confirms incidentally the statement of Bishop Neumann's biographer, that the saintly prelate had repeatedly offered to serve the missions in a more toilsome and less glorious field of labor than that which the important diocese of Philadelphia afforded.

The letter was written a short time before the appointment of Bishop James Frederic Wood as coadjutor, which arrangement appears to have been Rome's and the American Hierarchy's answer to Bishop Neumann's request to be transferred to a smaller and less important diocese. According to Fr. Berger's account[1]

[1] *Life of Bishop Neumann*, p. 416.

Philadelphia Fdr. 20 - 1857.

Right Rev.d & Dear Sir

At the last Provincial Council, which was held in Baltimore in Mai 1855. I expressed my desire to be transferred to some vacant Episcopal See of less importance than Philadelphia. Card. Franzoni was rather opposed to it, but Card. Barnabò wrote in October 1856 - that my transfer might take place. Though he stated that this matter would come up in November - we have received as yet no intimation whatever.

In this uncertainty I do not feel free to engage in any measure which will require some time yet to accomplish. Personally I would be more in favour of an American College in Rome - but consultations on its erections seem to have been adjourned sine die. If I am

to remain in Philadelphia, which is at present not improbable, I will certainly take an active part in the projected American College at Louvain. The high reputation for learning & discipline in Belgium is too well known as to allow me to hesitate a moment.

I will not fail to inform Your. Right Rev Sir, what part I would take, as soon as I will be certain that I am to remain in Philadelphia.

I remain with sincere esteem & veneration

Right Rev. Sir

Your most humble Servt. in Xt

✠ John N. Neumann

Bp of Phil[a]

Rt Rev P. P. Lefevre

Bp of Detroit

the Rev. J. F. Wood had been designated to act as first rector of the American College in Rome, which institution had been projected at the time, but was not actually founded until some two years later. In the meantime Bishops Spalding and Lefevre had proposed the foundation of the American College in Louvain and the Very Rev. Fr. Kindekens, Vicar General of Detroit, had been sent to Belgium with a view of having him take the rectorship, if the undertaking should succeed. The fact of the two American Colleges having thus been proposed almost simultaneously, accounts for some of the hesitancy on the part of the American bishop to endorse one in preference to the other. Happily both institutions became soon a reality, and at this date they have completely realized the most sanguine expectations of their early projectors.

Beyond this reference to the Louvain foundation the letter of Bishop Neumann strengthens our estimate of his humility, zeal for souls, and prudence in the management of practical affairs.

THE FIRST DECISION OF THE BIBLICAL COMMISSION.

Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW,

As one of many who, since August 30, 1901, have been looking forward anxiously to decisions by the Biblical Commission, I presume to ask for a small space in your pages.

The recent decision is that it is not lawful for the Catholic exegetist "*to solve the difficulties occurring in certain texts of Sacred Scripture, which appear to relate to historical facts, by asserting that in these we have to deal with a tacit or implicit quotation of a document written by an uninspired author, and that the inspired author did not at all intend to approve or to adopt all of these assertions, which cannot, therefore, be held as free from error*,"—except—"*in the case when, due regard being paid to the sense and judgment of the Church, it is proved by solid arguments: (1) that the sacred writer has really quoted the sayings or documents of another; and (2) that he has neither approved nor adopted them, so that he may be properly considered not to be speaking in his own name.*"

The decision admits the possibility of "*solid arguments*" to prove points (1) and (2) above, which relate to historical facts, and, moreover, seems to admit the legality of an "appeal to Cæsar" (history).

It may happen that the logically valid conclusion from the "*solid arguments*" will fall in line with the traditional sense and judgment of the Church. But a leading question here obtrudes itself: What course will be open to the Catholic exegetist if the logically valid conclusion turns out to be not substantially identical with the traditional sense and judgment of the Church?

J. S.

London, England.

The above question is exhaustively discussed in Father Truyols' article on the historical sense in its relation to Biblical Inspiration (pp. 113–127 of this issue).—EDITOR.

EPISCOPAL VISITATION.

The Bishop of Harrisburg addresses a Pastoral Letter to his clergy in which he says:

"His Eminence, the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, in a letter dated May 22d, ult., calls our attention to the fact that the prescribed Canonical Visitation of the Diocese has never been made. This defect in the administration of the diocese must be remedied; and it should be the desire of the clergy to have this Visitation performed at the regular stated times, and always performed in a becoming and proper manner. If we hope to have our orders respected by those who are subject to us, if we would drive home the principle of obedience to constituted authority in our several parishes—we must be the first to obey. And it is the proud boast of bishops and priests here in America that they always yield a prompt and cheerful obedience to their ecclesiastical superiors.

"We ask each pastor to secure five copies of *The Manual of the Episcopal Visitation* from the office of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, 1305 Arch Street, Philadelphia. The price of five copies is one dollar. These little books should be kept in the church, with the *Roman Ritual*, the *Manual of the Forty Hours' Devotion*, *The Racolta*, *The Meditations for Lent*, and *The Month of May*, and the other prayer books that are found in every well-furnished sacristy. *The Manual of the Episcopal Visitation* above referred to will be the official ceremonial of the diocese on the occasion of the bishop's Visitations."

THE MASS ORDO OF SECULAR CHAPLAINS FOR FRANCISCAN TERTIARIES.

In the July number of the REVIEW the question was asked whether a secular priest who is chaplain for a community of Franciscan Tertiaries is to follow the Ordo of the Franciscans or that of the diocese. We answered that unless the Sisters have a special rescript from the S. Congregation authorizing them to retain the Calendar of the Franciscans for their chapel the chaplain must say the Mass indicated by the diocesan calendar. This is the general rule according to a decree of the S. R. C., June 27, 1896.

A number of the Franciscan Fathers in different parts of the States, after reading the above mentioned solution, signified their dissent from our conclusion, and in support of the same kindly sent us the text of a decree according to which Tertiaries enjoy a special privilege which obliges chaplains to conform to the calendar of the Seraphic Order, under the above mentioned circumstances. The decree assumed to indicate this privilege is cited in the newest edition of P. Wapelhorst's *Compendium S. Liturgiae*, ed. VII, p. 61, n. 36, note 3; and p. 4, n. 400 of the Appendix for the Friars Minor, where we read as follows:

Pro Fratribus Minoribus Ordinis S. Francisci.

"Missa celebrari potest juxta Kalendarium Romano Seraphicum in Ecclesiis et Oratoriis omnibus quamquam privatis ad Tertium Ordinem S. P. N. Francisci etiam saecularem pertinentibus, vel ad alia spectantibus Religiosa Instituta in sui origine aut progressu conjunctionem aliquam cum Ordine Seraphico habentia; quamvis Fratres et Sorores, loco divini officii, recitare soleant officium Deiparae parvum aliasve preces."

The document reads plainly enough, but our correspondents have apparently overlooked the fact that the privilege accorded in the above terms to Tertiaries (both religious and seculars, *i. e.* those who live in community and those who live as a confraternity in the world) supposes a community to be under the exclusive direction of the Franciscan Fathers in such a way that secular chaplains or priests of any other Order have no jurisdic-

tion over them. Where, however, a secular priest or any other but a Franciscan acts as chaplain or as regular confessor, etc., of such communities, the privilege does not apply, for it is not a general decree, but one which is addressed exclusively to the Franciscan Fathers, being concerned with their special charge.

Since the question proposed in the REVIEW plainly and explicitly spoke of *secular* priests who act as chaplains for a Franciscan Tertiary Community, there was no reason why we should advert to any privilege accorded to the Franciscan Fathers under exceptional circumstances.

The annotator of Father Wapelhorst, O.S.F., sufficiently explains the difference we have pointed out; although it is quite evident (from the way in which some of our Franciscan readers have understood his citation of the *Ephemerides*) that the matter could be made even more plain; for it must not be overlooked that even where a member of a Religious Order is appointed chaplain to a community of nuns, he may not use the calendar of his Order, but is bound to the diocesan calendar, unless the community for which he says Mass is under the *exclusive charge* of the Franciscan Fathers. "Ubi unus tantum Sacerdos, quoad Missae celebrationem addictus sit Oratoriis competenti auctoritate erectis in domibus quarumcumque piarum Communitatum, hic, si sit Saecularis tenetur sequi Calendarium Dioecesis in qua exstat oratorium; et si *Regularis, calendarium Ordinis*, quatenus proprio gaudeat, *relinquere*."

Hence it would seem that even the Franciscan Fathers, saying Mass in the chapels of Franciscan Tertiaries, are obliged to conform to the diocesan calendar, whenever the community for which they say Mass happens to be under secular or other religious direction, as is most frequently the case in the United States.

We are thankful to have had this opportunity of emphasizing what appears to have been entirely misunderstood, and to state again the general rule for the observance of chaplains who say Mass in the oratories of religious communities. That rule makes for greater uniformity and hence for stronger catholicity. It is simply this:

Where a priest acts as chaplain for an institution, hospital, or religious community, he is bound in saying Mass to follow the

Ordo of the diocese in which the chapel or oratory is situated. This rule applies to all priests (chaplains) whether they be seculars or members of a Religious Order having its own Ordo; also to the visiting priests of whatever Order who may happen to say Mass in the same chapel or oratory.

DISPENSATIONS FROM LAWS AND IMPEDIMENTS.

The question of dispensations, particularly in reference to the sanctioning of marriage contracts, is one that harasses not only pastors who have to ask for such dispensations, but frequently also the Ordinaries who have to grant them. There is a general and vague impression that bishops are omnipotent in the matter of dispensing from impediments purely ecclesiastical, and that the granting or refusing of the privileges involved is a mere matter of form, if not of discretion or good-will. This is wholly erroneous.

The bishop is the dispenser of the ecclesiastical power, but he is at the same time under a conscientious obligation not to abuse this power. Hence he requires and must require good and valid reasons for most of the dispensations which he grants. There are no doubt few, if any, among us who fail to realize this responsibility when the law in the matter is very clear and explicit, but there are comparatively few who have a just conception of the bearing of all ecclesiastical laws involving dispensations.

It must be gratifying, therefore, to priests to find that their Ordinary takes special pains to explain to them the *rationale* and casual application of the obligations both he and they are under to act with just regard to the principles and laws of the Church in all matters that require a demand for the dispensary power. This is done by the Right Rev. Dr. Shanahan, who, in order to guide his priests more securely in their application for dispensations, has drawn up a series of succinct *Monita* which he desires pastors to read and study, so as to act understandingly in regard to such cases.

We print these *Monita* (six) as suggestive matter for others of the clergy to whom the perplexing nature of applications for dispensations appeals:—

De Impedimentorum Dispensatione.

Monitum 1.

Causa, ob quam petitur dispensatio exprimenda est in supplica, et quidem in dispensationibus vi potestatis delegatae faciendis *sub poena nullitatis.* Expresse hoc decrevit Bened. XIV. Const. Ad. Apost. 25 Feb., 1742. *Nulla igitur allegata causa, nulla est dispensatio,* licet forte causa, eaque sufficiens existat.—*Putzer: Commentarium in Facultates Apostolicas.*

Monitum 2.

Are dispensations *valid* when conceded by a bishop without sufficient cause? A bishop can dispense validly without just or sufficient cause: (1) from his own laws or those of his inferiors; (2) also from the laws of his superiors, when there is doubt either as to the existence *or* the sufficiency of a cause for dispensation; (3) it is certain that if he knowingly dispenses from the laws of his superiors—v. g., from *impediments*—without sufficient cause, the dispensation is *always unlawful,* and both the person asking for and those granting such dispensations commit sin. *Smith's Elements Eccl. Law.*

Monitum 3.

1. *Ad liceitatem* dispensationis semper aliqua causa requiritur. Ratio est, quia secus superior non erit fidelis dispensator. Idcirco peccat etiam qui in tali casu dispensationem petit; inducit enim dispensatorem ad rem illicitam, atque adeo peccat eodem peccati genere in petendo ac legislator in concedendo.—*S. Thomas.*

2. *Ad validitatem* vero nulla causa requiritur ex parte concedentis, si dispensat in sua aut in inferioris lege. Ratio est, quia ille qui potest ligare, etiam solvere potest; secus autem, si in lege sui superioris dispenset, quia non praesumitur accepisse potestatem temere dispensandi.

3. *Ad validitatem ex parte petentis* requiritur ut nulla sit in petitione obreptio aut subreptio essentialis, seu quae cadat in causam motivam, quia superior non dispensat nisi sub tacita conditione, scilicet, *si preces veritate nititur.*

Quaer. 1°. An peccat graviter superior dispensans sine causa in re gravi? Resp. Neg. probabiliter *per se,* quoad *legislatorem;*

quia praeciso scandalo vel aliorum damno, gravis non orietur deordinatio in re publica, propterea quod unus aut alter ex dispensatione legem non observet; secus vero dicendum quoad *inferiorem*, quia non censetur delegatus ad dispensationem nisi justa de causa: atque adeo si aliter faciat, graviter concessa sibi potestate abutitur, et admittat culpam ex genere suo gravem.

Quaer. 2°. An liceat petere vel concedere dispensationem in dubio, an causa sufficiat? Resp. Affirm. ad utrumque; ad 1^m^, quia non pertinet ad subditos de sufficientia causae judicare, sed tantum rem sincere superiori exponere; ad 2^m^ autem, quia secus onus superioribus impositum intolerabile evaderet, et innumeris scrupulis tum quoad dispensantem tum quoad petentes, esset obnoxium.—*Sabetti.*

Monitum 4.

DE MATRIMONIIS MIXTIS.

Circa dispensationem in impedimento mixtae religionis, sequentia notanda sunt:—

1. *Prima regula est*, ut exigantur *cautiones*, "quae remitti seu dispensari nunquam possunt, cum in ipsa naturali ac divina lege fundentur."—*Instr. Sect. Status.*

2. *Secunda est*, ut adsit *gravis causa* seu "*justa gravisque causa canonica*, sine qua permitti prorsus nequit, ut fideles gravibus periculis fidei ac *morum*, etiam sub opportunis cautionibus, sese exponant." *Instruct. S. C. P. F. 1868.* "Ac praeterea, intercedente *gravi* aliqua ac *plerumque publica* causa, quae si deficiat, licet caeterae supra memoratae adsint conditiones dispensatio nequaquam impertiri solet."—*Benedictus XIV.* "Si quaeras quaenam sit causa *justa, gravis, legitima, sufficiens, canonica*, propter quam haec dispensatio conceditur, respondeo: 1°. Bonum reipublicae christianae; 2°. Si in aliqua regione Catholici sunt pauci, et simul tuti ac liberi ad fidem profitendam, heterodoxi autem plurimi; 3°. Promissio ab haeretico facta in scriptis vel coram testibus et juramento firmata amplectendi Catholicam fidem post nuptias."—*Zitelli.* "Sed jam per se patet responsum absolute certum in abstracto dari non potest, cum semper considerandae sunt circumstantiae cujusque casus."—*Bangen.*

De gravitate et publicitate causae in matrimoniis mixtis, S. C. S. Off. rescripsit: "Matrimonium Catholicos inter et haereticos, etiamsi valida sint, sunt tamen illicita; et ideo non debes ea permittere, nisi ad hoc concurrat *causa gravis et* publica; et si agatur de causa privata talis esse debet, ut saltem *reductive* concernat bonum publicum ac Religionis."

Quaeritur quid sibi velint illa verba *reductive*, etc. "Nihil, ut arbitor, praeter hoc, quod bonum eorum qui connubium sunt inituri, satis non sit, nisi ratio quaepiam boni publici simul concurrat. Haec ratio boni publici occurret fere aliquo ex tribus modis.

Primo: Ut odio et quaerimoniis praecurratur haereticorum, qui Catholicos insimulare consueverunt intolerantiae, et animi angustiae, quoad eos qui Catholicam fidem haud profitentur.

Deinde: Pravum exemplum debet averti, sive id actu jam praebeatur amoribus aut etiam concubinato, sive praebendum in posterum metuatur ob connubium, puta posthabita Ecclesiae auctoritate, coram haeterodoxis ministellis fortasse ineundum; vel etiam ob Catholicam partem dispensationis renutu vehementer indignabundam, et ad hostium castra forte transfugituram.

Postremo: Ad bonum publicum revocari dicenda plane fuerit impedimento facta derogatio, ob speratum, connubii ope, vel christianae plebis praesidium, vel nostris et exteris singulare quodpiam conversionis exemplum."—*Gallo.*

Auctor doctus jam citatus loquitur quidem de causis pro matrimoniis mixtis inter baptizatos. Attamen apud nos, ut cuique notum est, matrimonium fidelium cum infidelibus tractantur eodem modo ac mixta (*i. e.* Catholicorum cum haereticis).—*Putzer.*

De causis privatis, theologus probatus *Bangen* dicit: "Causae quae *privata* magis commoda respiciunt, v. g. aetas superadulta, augustia loci, incompetentia dotis, bonum pacis, sponsalia bona fide contracta ob quae forat timendum ut innupta ac diffamata remaneret sponsa, de sensu S. Sedis non facile per se sufficiunt; attamen, in praxi nostra, ratio earundem causarum habetur, dummodo aliae rerum circumstantiae concurrant quibus illis pondus accrescat."

"Jam agitur de hisce circumstantiis concurrentibus, quibus causa privata completur. Tales, frequenter ut experientia docet, apud nos sunt amor quidem vesanus et admonitioni caritativae de pravis consequentiis matrimoniorum inter eos qui diversae sunt

religionis ineundorum impervius, quo fit, ut non obstante benevolentissima Parochi vel confessarii adhortatione perpetuo amoribus et familiaritatibus non raro cum maximo scandalo et periculo castitatis indulgent; difficultas inveniendi Catholicum eo quod maxima pars virorum in loco habitantium sit acatholica. In supplica pro dispensatione obtinenda, hae et similes causae *concurrentes* exponi debent."—*Putzer.*

Dispensatio sine justa causa ab Episcopo vi indulti seu vi facultatis concessa invalida est, et Episcopus circa sufficientiam causae debet sequi praxim Sedis Apostolicae.

3. *Tertia regula* est rubricalis et praecepit " ut haec mixta conjugia extra Ecclesiam et absque Parochi benedictione ulloque alio Ecclesiastico ritu celebrari debeant."

Monitum 5.

Ut licite ab omnibus denuntiationibus dispensetur, requiritur ut urgeat legitima, gravissima, et ineluctabilis causa.—*Benedict. XIV.*

Curent missionarii ut fideles ad sacramentum matrimonii recipiendum bene parati accedant, pro ipsius sacramenti sanctitate: quapropter ad sacramentum poenitentiae, et etiam ad Eucharistiam prius acedere eos hortentur. Ut autem ad hoc, quantum fieri potest, inducantur, et ut facilius inquiri possit, si quae forte impedimenta matrimonio obstent, commendamus pastoribus curare ut fideles consilium suum matrimonii ineundi ante tres saltem hebdomadas illis significent.

Monitum 6.

Quamvis *ore* petitio pro dispensatione fieri valeat, melius ac tutius fit *in scriptis.* In praxi Rom. Congregationes nonnisi scriptas petitiones admittunt. Jussu *Leonis XIII,* 10 Dec. 1891, dispensationes ordinarie non debent telegraphice peti, ob incommoda quae ex hac agendi ratione facile occurrere possunt; eadem regula in Episcopalibus curiis observari debet.

THE RIGHT AND PRIVILEGE OF GIVING BENEDICTION.

Qu. Some of my neighbors deem it necessary to ask permission at the Chancery to expose the Blessed Sacrament on certain days in their parish churches or in the convent-chapels attached to said churches. I have maintained that no episcopal approbation is needed for such exposition, which is usually requested for the first Friday of the month. Am I right?

Resp. According to the canon law[1] of the United States, solemn Exposition and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament may be given in any church or chapel—where the prescribed ceremonies for such function can be duly observed—on all Sundays, holidays of obligation, and feasts of the first and second class throughout the year. Likewise twice each week in Lent, every day during a Mission or Retreat, on the feast of the Sacred Heart, for the Forty Hours' Adoration, and on all other days which may have been specially designated by the Ordinary of the diocese. On these days Benediction is permitted once only. On the feast of Corpus Christi and during its entire octave, Exposition and Benediction may be given after the Solemn Mass in the morning and again at Vespers in the evening. "Per octavam vero Corporis Domini licebit eam solemniter fieri tum in Missa solemni, tum in Vesperis, Benedictione iterato data."

Outside the designated days which, by customary concession of our Bishops, include the First Friday devotions every month, and other regular sodality celebrations instituted with the knowledge and consent of the Ordinary, it is not permitted to expose the Blessed Sacrament except by the express permission of the Ordinary,—"nisi venia Ordinarii expressa, salvis etiam in omnibus S. C. R. hac in re decretis." The matter is therefore defined by law, and beyond this is not left to the discretion of anybody but the Ordinary.

[1] Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, Tit. VI, C. II, n. 375.

Criticisms and Notes.

CATHOLICITY AND PROGRESS IN IRELAND. By the Rev. M. O'Riordan, D.D. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.; Fribourg and St. Louis, U. S. A.: Herder.

During the last ten years Ireland has been suffering from a plague of reformers. Some of these are reformers from within; and allowing for excess of zeal and occasional imprudences, their efforts are deserving of all praise. And they come before the public with the specific credentials of a perfect knowledge of the wants of the people, and a sense of the propriety, and even necessity, of recasting and remoulding Irish life on purely Irish principles.

The others are reformers *ab extra*—some of them mere tourists or trippers, who land at Queenstown or Dublin, visit the Giant's Causeway, spend two days in Killarney, and go home to write a book on the unhappy country whose history is the great black blot on England's administration. Others are resident in the country and try to look at things more closely and even sympathetically. These cannot be accused of flippancy, or even of superficiality. The fault lies deeper in their utter incapacity for understanding the genius of the people—the characteristics cut deep down into the national ideas and feelings by tradition and heredity, by social sentiment, and religious and historical legacies.

To this latter class belongs Sir Horace Plunkett, Chairman of the Agricultural Board of Ireland. I think no one doubts Sir Horace Plunkett's sincerity. He believed he saw certain great evils existent in Ireland, and he set himself with free valor to encounter them and overcome them. He planned, organized, lectured, travelled, spared neither money, time, nor trouble, to push on the industrial development of Ireland. Some of his methods succeeded; others, like the Creamery Association, failed, after having proved disastrous to many a town and country district in Ireland. Then in an evil moment Sir Horace Plunkett rushed into print; and from the date of the publication of his book all his influence may be said to have ceased. It was denounced by the whole National Press, condemned by the Cardinal Archbishop of Armagh, and other bishops, and it furnished a text for hundreds of speeches, hardly one of which expressed the

slightest sympathy either with the book or its author. Yet there were excellent points and suggestions in *Ireland in the New Century;* but one unhappy and utterly false assumption ran through it from beginning to end, vitiated all its arguments, refuted its premises, and made its conclusion and suggestions valueless in the eyes even of those who professed the greatest admiration for its author. This was the unhappy idea, so deeply rooted in the minds of Protestants, that the Catholic Church in Ireland, as elsewhere throughout the world, is the natural and hereditary enemy of progress. The theory is so old and weather-beaten that it is surprising that a man of Sir Horace Plunkett's ability and intelligence could have been betrayed into reviving it and using it as an argument for his own purposes. One would suppose that at this time in the history of the world these ancient charges against the Church were relegated to little Bethels, or the crude pedagogism of Sunday-schools. But we fear some of our Protestant brethren are like the Bourbons—they cannot learn, and they cannot forget. At any rate, Sir Horace Plunkett repeated in his own form the stock accusation, and—his influence in Ireland has ceased forever.

One important event, however, has resulted from the issue of this ill-digested book. It has elicited from the Rev. Dr. O'Riordan, of Limerick, a reply which is not only a crushing answer to Sir Horace Plunkett's indictment against the Catholic Church, but—what is far more important—a final and conclusive answer to the general and traditional misrepresentation. So far as Sir Horace Plunkett's book is concerned, one begins to feel a certain pity for him as his powerful antagonist takes up point after point and relentlessly and remorselessly refutes it. The refutation is almost too labored and complete. It leaves absolutely no room for reply. Facts and figures, quotations from Protestant writers, admissions of bigoted and partisan historians, are marshalled with such unerring skill and accuracy that there is no room for question or appeal. "Out of thy own mouth I judge thee," says the apologist for his country and creed; and there can be no contesting the fact that the judgment is final. At least Sir Horace Plunkett declines to contravene the vast mass of testimony arrayed against him, although he issues his book again in popular form, and at a popular price.

The book discusses all the leading questions which agitate Irish public life at present. Whoever desires to know what the Catholic side has to say will find what he wants in this book; and the Catholic who wants a reply to charges made by the other side will find more

than enough for his purpose. The reader will best understand the wide range of the work from the following extract which I make from the Preface :—

"After having in Chapter II discussed the charge made against the Catholics in Ireland, of extravagance in church-building, I pass on to consider whether the social influence of the Catholic faith is responsible, to the large extent alleged, for their present economic condition, or whether that condition can be fully accounted for by other causes. With that view I first discuss the meaning of human progress ; the relation of Catholic teaching to it ; then the application of that teaching as illustrated in certain Catholic nations, and the application of other teachings in other countries. I next proceed to account for the exceptional case of Catholic Ireland ; and in order to make my position clear I begin by discussing the meaning of what Sir Horace Plunkett calls 'Character and *Morale*.' Then through several chapters I discuss the legislative and economic factors which have left the Catholics of Ireland in the condition in which they find themselves to-day. I next pass on to inquire into the relation of the priests to the social, political, and industrial interests of the people, and their influence in each. Having done that, I thought I had established my right, and I think it was my duty, to turn back and ask what the Government, the Landlords, and the Protestant Church got from the country, and what has each done in return for its social and industrial good. In the next place I discuss the charges made against Convents, and their relation to the temporal concerns of the people. Finally, in one long chapter I review the history of education in Modern Ireland. The object of the chapter is to show how grievously Sir Horace Plunkett misrepresents facts in speaking of the priests' almost undisputed influence on education. The plain conclusion to be drawn from the statement of facts which I make, is : that the difficulty has been to secure so much influence as would enable them to guard the faith of the people from persistent plans of perversion."

The following will give an idea of the author's method. In the chapter in which he considers the charge of extravagant church-building he thus proceeds : "The sort of house which a people build to God depends on the form of their worship. A people who did not believe in God at all would not, of course, think of building a church wherein to worship Him. It would be a work without meaning or merit. The positivist, whose 'God' is humanity, is satisfied with a hall. An agnostic needs only the earth and heaven above to worship the Great Unknown, hidden behind boundless space and time. The awe which that contemplation inspires gives his religion a resonance which is wanting in that of the positivist. But Catholics believe in God and in Divine Providence, and they feel the need of a special

place devoted to His servive, because men are socially as well as individually bound to divine worship. And they do not think that any sort of a place is good enough for the purpose. Their faith and love, and their feeling of homage, would express themselves not merely in bricks and mortar, but in beauty of architecture, painting, and sculpture. The Protestant cannot understand that, because he cannot appreciate the Catholic ideal; and I do not blame him. He thinks that a quadrilateral edifice, with bare walls, like a barn, is enough. And why not, since he has nothing to put into it? For him God is present in the church only as He is present in one's home, in the fields, or in the woods. The Irish people with their instinctive insight into religious ideals, commonly call a Protestant place of worship 'the preaching church.' But Catholics believe in the Real Presence; and therefore instead of a communion table which satisfies the purpose of Protestantism, they employ art to build a church and an altar of beauty around the tabernacle where the Incarnate God reposes under the sacramental species. They believe in the veneration and intercession of saints, and memorials of them in the form of frescoes or statues is another element of adornment and expense." Then having fortified himself with a long extract from Ruskin's *Seven Lamps of Architecture*, he discusses the spiritual and the material ideal, and convicts of inconsistency by instances taken from their own action those who consider the cost of church-building from an economic standpoint. So far so good; but the reader cannot help asking himself—Is not Ireland very poor? Has she not more churches for her population, and more expensive ones, than she ought? The reader will soon find what he desiderates quite satisfied by an array of statistics taken from original sources, and of facts taken from the writer's experience.

I give one more instance of the writer's method, from the chapter on "The Catholic Church and Progress." He first formulates Sir Horace's argument thus: "Individuality and self-reliance are necessary for industrial progress. But the reliance of Catholics on authority represses individuality, and checks self-reliance. Therefore, the religion of Roman Catholics is essentially an impediment to industrial progress. Moreover, industrial progress demands the development of the qualities of this life. But Catholicism completely shifts the moral centre of gravity to the other life. Hence the absence of those qualities in Catholics which make for industrial progress." Then he proceeds as follows to analyze it:

"Now, I might admit all that, and pass it by as being outside the business of the Catholic Church. Even though I granted that Catholicism is an obstacle to industrial progress, there would be no ground for complaint, unless it professed, or ought to have professed, to promote the temporal interests of man. Not till the State is blamed for not making Saints, may it be fairly laid to the fault of the Church that she cannot invent a steam-engine or construct a tariff. She has been the means of numberless blessings to humanity; but she is not to be judged by these, since she does not take them within the scope of her institution or her work. The want which Sir Horace Plunkett finds in Catholicism, any Roman citizen would have found in the teaching of Christ. Any economist of old Rome might object that He made no provision for commercial enterprise, said nothing about the Copper or Corn Trade in the Sermon on the Mount; in fact, that His principles tended to tear up by the roots the very idea of Roman citizenship. . . . The Christian is not obliged to forego wealth, but is warned of its dangers; the Pagan man of material progress must look on wealth as the one thing it behooves him to have, and must try to have it anyhow. To the mind of the Roman imperialists, the early Christians no doubt wanted that individuality which Sir Horace Plunkett finds wanting in Catholics to-day. Like the Catholicism of to-day, they placed their centre of gravity in another life. Yet Roman society contained the germs of decay, and soon fell of its own weight and through its own rottenness. To Christianity fell the task of building up society again, and Christianity succeeded in the task."

After more such analysis comes an array of non-Catholic evidence, followed by a few chapters devoted to an economic inquiry into the comparative social condition of England and America on the one hand as types of the non-Catholic spirit, and of Belgium, the Rhenish Provinces, and Spain as types of the Catholic spirit. Then, as he observes in the Preface, having shown that the Church has done more than she professes to do, he discusses through several chapters the causes of the exceptional condition of Catholic Ireland.

But this is not the real merit of Dr. O'Riordan's book. This controversy, as it affects Ireland, is ephemeral. Already the book that originated it has passed from notice; and although it would be too much to expect that the charges of a reactionary spirit against the priesthood and the Church shall not be repeated, it is quite certain that they will be received in future with caution, if not incredulity. So far, therefore, as the passing phase of the question is concerned, we may regard it as almost at an end. But the subject is one that concerns the Church throughout the world; it is important to know, and to be able to prove, that the Catholic Church, whilst adhering

with a rigid and unbroken uniformity to the traditions of Christianity and the literal teachings of the Gospel, is by no means inimical to the spirit of progress and industrial expansion; and here Dr. O'Riordan's book is quite a cyclopædia of minute information and close argument which will be found useful long after the tumult raised by the controversy in Ireland has subsided. For the book deals not only with Ireland, but with France and Spain, and Belgium, with America and the Philippines, with past history and present events. And, if we do not misunderstand the force of the book, we think that the author has accumulated, at an enormous expenditure of time and labor, facts, figures, and arguments that will save many a future apologist from the labor of looking up statistics and historical records to prove the solicitude of the Church, not only for the spiritual, but also for the natural interests of mankind.

Thus for Belgium he gives us the population for several years to show the increase. Then he goes on to show how that increasing population is supported; for which we get statistics of exports and imports; the number of miles of railway; Savings-Bank deposits, etc. Then we are treated to a close and lengthened inquiry into the method pursued by the Belgians to secure their phenomenal progress,—factories, coöperative societies in trade and agriculture, etc.; and no statement is made without statistics to support it. Notwithstanding the array of figures, they are so systematically woven into the statement that the whole makes interesting reading even for one who only wants to read for a passing pleasure. It will be news to many that Belgium is not much larger than the size of Munster, but it supports a population of about 7,000,000; that it has 3,000 miles of railway, besides canals and other means of transport; that there are nearly 800 agricultural leagues; 96 technical schools for boys and girls; that, in fine, the Belgians support nine-tenths of their population with the produce of their own land, besides exporting each year $100,000,000 of agricultural produce.

In his final chapters the author has carried the war into the enemy's country, and with a *tu quoque* argument has turned back the tide of aggression upon his antagonist. Probably for the present issue of the controversy, this fact may prove the most effective, because it is no secret that Sir Horace Plunkett and other writers have really been seeking to disguise the iniquities of governmental administration in Ireland by attributing the backward condition of the country to the influence of the Church and the priesthood. The Land League agita-

tion brought before the world the painful condition of the Irish serf, and the Press of Europe was not slow to circulate the many instances of landlord rapacity and departmental connivance that were brought before the public by evictions, and persecutions, and *reprisals*.

To turn away men's thoughts from these details that reflect such little credit on the public administration of Irish affairs, was considered very desirable by that element of society in Ireland which had to bear the odium of atrocious land laws and the consequent commercial depression of the country. If not quite candid, at least it was a clever stratagem. It is not inequitable land laws, it is not evil administration, it is not crushing taxes, it is not absenteeism, that are the causes of Irish misery. It is the fact that the Irish are taught by their religion to place their hopes in another and shadowy world; that they bear with equanimity evil economic conditions, and place their hopes in eternity; that they build churches, hospitals, schools, convents, but will not give a penny to ironclads or factories; and that the Irish priest is the cause of all this painful retrogression, and has besides stamped out the vitality of the race by a rigid and despotic enforcement of a chastity which another writer has described as "awful."

Unhappily for such theories Dr. O'Riordan has insisted on pushing aside this special pleading, and showing in their darkest colors the iniquities of the classes and the cliques who dominate Irish life. It was a splendid opportunity and he seized it. I doubt if in the pages of J. K. L. or Dr. McHale, there is such a scathing exposure of landlord rapacity, sectarian partiality, and governmental incompetence as is to be found in this book.

Whoever reads Chapter XVI on "The Government and the Garrison in Ireland," and Chapter XVII on "The Protestant Church in Ireland," will feel much better or much worse according to the disposition which he takes to the reading of them; but everyone who reads them will be much richer in information not easily obtained though often desiderated. We learn the direct and indirect cost of carrying the Union; we have information on the comparative crime in those countries for which police are needed. We learn that absentee landlords received from Ireland during the early years of the last century $10,000,000 annually, which they spent everywhere except where the money was made. That annual drain we are told was $20,000,000 before 1830 and had risen to $30,000,000 before the year 1843. We learn also what will come on most persons by surprise, that, leaving out those employed in teaching and giving missions, in Ireland there

is one priest to every 1,206 of the Catholic population; including all the priests, there is one for every 934; that in Great Britain there is a priest for every 542 of the population; that in Ireland there is one Episcopalian parson for every 331 Episcopalian Protestants; one Presbyterian minister for every 554 Presbyterians; and one Methodist minister for every 248 Methodists. Thus, with facts and figures and official reports does he cut through piles of misrepresentation. The revenues of the Protestant Church, how its churches were got, repaired, and let go to ruin, and how the money went, is reading which one is not likely to forget for a long time. This is the author's general summing up of the contents of the two chapters:—

"I have now made a general review of the revenues received by Government, by the Protestants as landlords and public-officials, and by the Protestant Church from Ireland. They have had the power, the social influence, the patronage, and the wealth of the country. Sir Horace Plunkett tells us that they have the 'civic virtues and efficiencies,' of which he also tells us the Catholics are bereft. Very well then, they might have easily moved the economic forces of the country on toward material progress, and, as we are assured, they alone know how to do it. Have they done it? Have they used those 'strenuous qualities' which, we are told, they brought over with them across the Channel? Their public advantages, their unlimited power, and their indefinitely acquirable wealth, surely incurred some social responsibility. They surely had a duty toward the country when their wealth and power came. How did they respond to that responsibility? How did they do that duty?"

And after telling us how, in the words of a Scotch authority, he writes:—

"But they let their opportunities go to waste. As a body they thought only of themselves. They behaved as if Ireland were they themselves; as if they were everybody; and as if the Catholics of Ireland were nobody. It must be in that sense that they say they have always consulted for the interests of the country, inasmuch as what they did for themselves they did for Ireland; for they and the Ireland of their ideal are one. . . . As a body, Irish Protestants lived *in* Ireland, they lived *on* Ireland, but they did not live *for* Ireland. As a body they lived for themselves alone. They lived out of the country as much as they could. They misspent their opportunity and their power to improve it. They had their day, and now that it is declining, they would persuade the public if they could, that its undeveloped condition is due to the uneconomic trend of our Catholic faith; and the uneconomic character of our Catholic people whose energies are paralyzed, whose hopes are blasted. It is a pity that Sir

Horace has let himself be led into the choir to join the chorus, for through many notes he does not chant in harmony with them. The County Councils and other public bodies will have a busy time of it for many a day gathering together and putting in order the neglected economic elements of the country, after the rigid narrowness, the creed and class selfishness, the incapacity or carelessness and the mismanagement of generations.''

There is one feature of this new aggression on the Irish Church and priesthood that deserves notice before we conclude this short review. It is that every argument used by their adversaries against the Irish Church and priesthood tells with equal force against Christianity itself. In fact it is not Catholicity but Christianity and the Gospels that are attacked. It is an ominous feature, and one is puzzled to understand how gentlemen like these modern reformers and writers can sit placidly under their pulpits on Sunday mornings and hear the Gospel of renunciation and self-denial read, and then not only practise the contrary, but preach it by speech, and book and pamphlet during the week. It is a curious inconsistency ;—but is it really inconsistency, or merely a conformity to customs that subsist whilst the essence of them has departed forever ? One does not know what to think, but a candid writer of this class has put his own opinions and those of his co-religionists clearly enough :—

''If it should be urged that the ideal of material progress, as an indispensable preliminary to the higher spiritual civilization, or, we may say, Anglicization of the world, is our idea, which cannot well be reconciled with all the doctrines of Christianity—we would reply that this only holds of the 'literal' or, as Swift said, 'real' Christianity—to establish which would indeed be (again in Swift's words) 'a wild project'; it would be to dig up foundation ; to destroy at one blow all the wit and half the learning of the Kingdom ; to break the entire frame and constitution of things ; to ruin trade ; extinguish arts and sciences with the profession of them ; in short, to turn our courts, exchanges, and shops into deserts ; and would be full as absurd as the proposal of Horace when he advises the Romans all in a body to leave their city, and seek a new seat in some remote part of the world by way of cure for the corruption of their manners. And of this impossible ideal, the preposterous and unprogressive religion, it is as true to-day as in Swift's time, that it has been for some time wholly laid aside by general consent (of the

Anglo-Saxon world) as utterly inconsistent with our present schemes of wealth and power." [1]

We think Dr. O'Riordan's book goes to prove that in Ireland at least the "real" and the "literal" Christianity still subsists, and is not incompatible with human happiness and progress, although it would be hard to reconcile it with the modern craze of Imperialism.

P. A. SHEEHAN, D.D.

Doneraile, Ireland.

ETUDES D'HISTOIRE ET DE THEOLOGIE POSITIVE. Deuxième Serie. L'Eucharistie: La Presence Réelle et La Transsubstantiation. Par Pierre Batiffol. Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre. 1905. Pp. 388.

The preceding series of historico-theological studies by the scholarly Rector of the Catholic Institute of Toulouse treated of the *Disciplina Arcani*, the origin of the Sacrament of Penance, the early ecclesiastical hierarchy and the *Agapé*.

The volume devoted to these subjects appeared in 1902, and has since passed into a third edition. The present volume is devoted entirely to the doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist. The method here followed is similar to that of its predecessor. The texts concerned with the doctrine are studied in the light of the time and the historical setting of their composition and are made by comparison to be their own interpreters. The comparative process brings out their central idea, the permanence of which is revealed throughout its gradual elaboration under the light of theological reflection. No other doctrine blends so intimately with the deepest life and piety of the faithful, none so inspires thought by its ineffable mystery, as does the Blessed Eucharist. At the same time, viewed from a historico-theological standpoint, no other doctrine affords so striking an illustration of the law of development emphasized by Cardinal Newman. While it is this aspect of the dogma that Mgr. Batiffol primarily considers, the practical or devotional element can never escape the consciousness of the intelligent, much less of the devout, reader. No one of Catholic instinct, who follows the unfolding of the doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist as the author portrays it, can fail to have his faith brightened and his love quickened as he witnesses the deepening and enrichment of the mind of the Church in the consciousness of her infinite treasure.

Besides being a contribution of distinct merit to positive theology

[1] *To-Day and To-Morrow in Ireland*, Stephen Gwynn, Chap. IX.

and indirectly an aid to devotional life, the book is no less valuable from an exegetical point of view for the light it throws on the pertinent texts, as also from a controversial standpoint for its keen criticism of certain naturalistic theories that have recently been put forth in Germany, France, and England. On these diverse accounts the book has a claim on the interest of the educated Catholic, lay or cleric, as well as the professional theologian.

PIERLUIGI DA PALESTRINA. Zehn ausgewählte vierstimmige Messen für Sopran, Alt, Tenor, und Bass, redigiert von Hermann Bäuerle, Fürstlich Thurn- und Taxisschem Hofgeistlichen in Regensburg, Priester der Diözese Rottenburg. Opus 25. Modernisierte, kritisch-korrekte Ausgabe. 3te Auflage. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel. 1905. Pp. 224.

This modernized and accurate edition of some of the more celebrated Palestrina Masses should be found most useful in the practical restoration among us of the *polyphonia* of the classic days. An important step is effected when polyphonic composition is thus released from the elaborateness of the customary representation *in score*, and reduced—as is possible when the voice parts number four—to a more generally comprehensible delineation upon two staves of the *G* and *F* clefs, which are generally adopted as the standard basis for the four part vocal composition of our times, and are the only ones commonly understood among our singers. The text is gracefully phrased, and the director will find a useful guide to finished interpretation in the metronomic and dynamic indications which Father Bäuerle clearly explains are not to be considered as absolute, but merely as suggestive of means by which the elasticity necessary to fluency of rendition may be realized.

The same publishers have already issued two Masses and fifteen Motets for four-voice parts by Ludovico da Vittoria, which are to be followed later by five others of his Masses, all edited by Father Bäuerle. Thirty Palestrina Motets, similarly edited, are promised during the year.

GEORGE HERBERT WELLS.

THE ETHICS OF FORCE. By H. E. Warner. Published for the International Union. Boston: Ginn & Company. 1905. Pp. 126.

The author of this little book tells us that he had once been "slow to accept evolution as relates to the origin of species;" he "refused to be called a mammal or the son of a mammal, unwilling to recog-

nize his remote simian ancestor, not to speak of tracing descent from a speck of protoplasm" (p. 4). It was surely unfortunate for the truth and the cogency of his thought that he ever came to a radical change in this point of view; for now that he looks upon the evolutionary process as embracing all creation—"as holding man in its grasp, his physical as well as his psychic nature, and controlling all the movements of society"—he is necessarily committed to the logical consequences of such a position, a materialistic world-view and a purely utilitarian standard of morals. For if "reason . . . had its origin among animals far below man" (p. 7), then man is distinguished specifically from his reputed simian progenitors by no immaterial constituent, and he can consequently have no essentially higher perception of the universe, no explicit knowledge of himself, his nature, origin and destiny, and consequently again no appreciation of things super-material and, therefore, no motive urging to self-restraint or moral conduct, except the subservience of his material interests.

The author may probably decline to accept these bald deductions from his principle, for he more than once explicitly admits the existence of God. How he can make this confession, however, without recognizing in himself an immaterial energy, postulating a higher origin than that of a material evolutionary process, is intelligible only in the light of the fact that a man's personality, being more accommodating than his logical faculty, is capable of storing away inconsistencies in separate departments. By this same personal capaciousness one might account for the author's recognition of ethical principles and standards, for surely there is no room for moral quality in a being that contains nothing more than a highly complex arrangement of moving molecules, as must be the case with man in the extreme evolutionary hypothesis. One need not, however, adhere too rigidly to this scheme of personal accommodation, for the author is in so far consistent with his principles as to identify moral motive with utility.

His book, though entitled the *Ethics of Force*, which being interpreted means the morality or rather the immorality of war, is in fact a plea for the *uselessness* of war. If the "mass of men can be brought to see the expensiveness of war not to a figment called government," to see that the adjustment of international differences may be secured more economically than by mutual destruction, "then war will cease." Viewed in this light—that is, as an argument for the inutility of war, as a demonstration that internecine strife makes for deterioration, not for the evolution, of humanity—in a word, as a proof that war does

not pay in any final sense of the term gain—the book contains much that deserves praise. The reasoning is often keen, generally plausible, mostly clever, sometimes interspersed with wit, pointed by epigram. The author sees his side of the case very clearly and presents it forcibly. The substance of the book having been originally delivered as lectures before an Ethical Club (Washington, D. C.), the imaginative element has been given considerable freedom. Sometimes, indeed, the freedom runs quite into license and utterly riots with the truth. Notably, though not exclusively, is this the case in the description of the evolution of the human race (p. 23 ff.).

Occasionally the fictional tendency, prompted, one may trust, more by ignorance than prejudice, terminates at injustice as well as untruth. For instance here: "Until the temporal power was lost to the Pope there was never any doubt as to the right and duty of employing it directly for the destruction of heathen or heretical governments and institutions" (p. 67). This statement we can characterize as nothing short of calumny. Hardly less so is the following: "Traditional Christianity has never stopped to enquire whether men desire it. From its vantage ground it has said they need and must have it whether they will or no" (p. 68).

Other such misstatements of matters religious might easily be cited; but these will suffice to show that truth in a most important subject has not been always too scrupulously safeguarded.

LEHRBUCH DER NATIONALÖKONOMIE. Von Heinrich Pesch, S.J. Erster Band. Grundlegung. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdersche Verlagshandlung; St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. Pp. xiv—485.

Out of the large and ever-growing literature of Political Economy one has no difficulty in selecting books of considerable merit and importance as regards their descriptive and more or less scientific character. They bring out into relief, classify with fair adequacy, and reduce to something like general laws, the immediate factors and phenomena of economic activity. Most of them, however, not only distinguish, but completely separate, the science of political economy from philosophy, especially from ethics. At most they admit some connection between certain psychological and economic laws.

Conceived from an almost entirely empirical point of view and wrought out mainly on analytical lines such works, whilst serviceable for their data and proximate inferences, do not satisfy the thoughtful mind and are very generally marred by serious errors. Divorcing the

instruments and methods of acquiring material goods from man's higher nature, psychological and moral, their principles float in the air and their science has neither solid basis nor consistency.

On the other hand there are works, although probably not so many, that go to the opposite extreme. They abound in *a priori* and visionary speculation. Conceived from an abstract point of view and excessively deductive in method, they furnish a sort of philosophy but no adequate science of economy. As such their importance is small. They are not informative, but merely feebly suggestive and slightly interesting. Obviously the ideal treatment of matters economic will be that which strikes its roots deeply and broadly in man's complete nature, and which draws its primary principles from an adequate psychology embracing man's intellectual and moral as well as physical requirements; which, moreover, interprets, unfolds, and applies those principles in correspondence with man's actual environment, individual, domestic, civil, and political, a science, therefore, which is harmoniously inductive and deductive, analytic and synthetic.

The foundations of such an economic are laid in Father Pesch's *Lehrbuch*,— rather we should say the roots are here planted; for the work is an *organism*, a unified system, with a determinate tendency to, and in part anticipation of, a future growth. A glance through the present volume enables one to discern the plan and controlling principles of the entire work. Man, and not merely certain of his activities and tendencies, is the adequate subject as well as the end of economics. Hence economic activity must be studied from the standpoint not only of efficiency but also of finality. Moreover, the end determining that activity is social as well as individual. Thus the idea dominating the system is that of *social justice*,—justice not merely for the individual but for the whole, for every human class and state.

The principle of solidarity is the highest and the final organizing principle of political economy,—solidarity as a mediating principle between individualism and socialism. While this conception introduces and directs a primarily philosophical, it leaves ample room or rather calls for a closely scientific, practical as well as theoretical, study of the more concrete phenomena of economic life. This is apparent already in the portion of the work at hand, which, although mainly philosophical, shows even in its first chapter, in the brief treatment of the concepts of *value*, *price*, *money*, etc., the practical fruitage of ultimate principles. It will be doubtless more fully obvious in the two other volumes promised for the near future, which

are to treat respectively of general and special economics,—and in which ample space will be given to the discussion of the leading problems of social reform which so largely agitate the thoughtful and sympathetic minds of to-day.

Next to the solid groundwork, broad plan, coherent development, luminous method, and perspicuous style patent in the present volume, the spirit in which it is all conceived and wrought out, cannot fail to commend itself even to readers who differ in religious belief from the author. Political economy is with the author a wholly natural science, in the sense that its principles are discovered and developed by reason alone. Nevertheless, though faith be not its basis nor its organ, it may well and indeed should suggest its motive; and this it has done in the present case.

"Der Beweggrund ist uns durch unsern Glauben gegeben. Mich erbarmt des Volkes, sprach der göttliche Erlöser. In dieser Gesinnung gehen wir an die Arbeit, wollen wir mithelfen nach dem Mase unserer Kraft oder Schwäche zum Wohle unseres Volkes. Unvergesslich bleibt mir ein schönes Wort meines teuern, allzu früh verstorbenen Jugendfreundes und Studiengenossen Leopold Wilhemi, Präsidenten des kaiserlichen statistichen Amtes: 'Ernennungen und Auszeichnungen,' sagte er, 'haben mir immer nur einen Tag wirklich Freude gemacht; was meinem Herzen Frieden verleiht, das ist das Bewusstsein, etwas für die armen Leute geleistet zu haben.' In der Tat, soziale Arbeit, im Geiste der christlichen Nächstenliebe geübt, das gibt Frieden und Gottes Segen für Zeit und Ewigkeit."

This benevolent motive will of course be effectual not by the immediate contact of the present learned treatise with the poor, but by the mental and moral stimulus and devotion it must afford to the leaders of the people,—the clergy and the educated laity. To them it almost exclusively appeals. May they recognize and extend its meaning.

LE NEO-CRITICISME DE CHARLES RENOUVIER. Theorie de la Connaissance et de la Certitude. Par E. Janssens, D.J.C., Ph.D. Louvain, Institut superieur de Philosophie. Paris: Felix Alcan. 1904. Pp. viii—318.

LES FONDEMENTS DE LA CONNAISSANCE ET DE LA CROYANCE. Examen Critique du Neo-Kantisme. Par P. Vallet. Paris: P. Lethielleux, Libraire-Editeur. Pp. xii—436.

These two volumes of what may be called *Fundamental Philosophy* are mutually supplementary. The first, by one of the professors in the *Institut superieur de philosophie* at Louvain, is descriptive and critical; the second, by the author of a number of well and favorably known philosophical productions, and at present professor in the

Seminary of Clermont, is also critical, though in the main constructive.

Doctor Janssens gives a sketch of the life and works of Renouvier, the leading defender in France during the past half century of a revival of a modified *Kantism*, known as *Neo-Criticisme*. Père Vallet undertakes a defence of philosophical certitude, the objectivity of knowledge, and especially of the validity of human cognition in respect to the fundamental concepts—substance, causality, the universe, the soul, the absolute, God. About one-fourth of the volume is devoted to the bases of belief—faith, dogma, apologetics. The latter work therefore extends somewhat the matter of the former on the constructive side, although in certain points the subjects overlap.

The modern evil, as Père Vallet observes, is *le mal des esprits*. It has its source in the higher ranges of thought, in philosophy, and works havoc in human life never so effectually as when it conceals itself behind the plausible theory that philosophical speculation has nothing to do with practice. No, to quote M. Vallet again, the human mind may not sport with principles. Ordinarily, indeed, their consequences are not fully discerned at the start; but time, that inflexible logician, will roll them out one by one.

The germ of *subjectivism*, the canker-worm of modern philosophy, is found in the Cartesian principles, which make the *ego* the starting-point and the centre of philosophy, mistrust the objectivity of sense perception, thus preparing the way for idealism and individualism, separate soul from body, thought from sensation, idea from reality, the present from the past and tradition. But, as our author observes, it was left to Kant to systematize the new ideas, and to the positivists to apply them to every department of thought. Kant maintained that in the domain of theory man can apprehend phenomena only. What things are in themselves he cannot know. By an inconsequence—happy for himself at least—he assigned to *practical reason* the power to assert the objectivity of the supersensible order. The behest of duty demands the *existence* of those supreme ideas whose validity is unknowable by *pure*, that is, speculative reason—immortality, freedom, and God. Of the *nature*, however, of the supersensible or noumenal order, man is by the very structure of his cognitive faculties precluded from knowing anything.

It was left to Kant's disciples to draw the conclusions from the master's premises, so that now *phenomenalism* and *agnosticism*, *relativism*, and *evolutionism* have become with very many the final word

of the critical philosophy. The tenets of Neo-Criticism are thus summarized by the author:—man can know nothing except by his faculties, and these are essentially subjective and relative; so long as he confines himself to sensation and thought, he is not deceived; but if he attempt to pass beyond himself and to discourse about the outside world, he abandons science and simply projects the dreams of phantasy. The old philosophy thought to read the inwardness of things; beneath the phenomena it put substances, under the properties natures and essences, back of effects causes. Now substance, essence, cause are mental forms, subjective figments devoid of reality. For the positivist, the true criticist, there are only facts and laws, motions and groups of motions (viii).

It is thus apparent how positivism and agnosticism are the logical consequences of the Kantian principles.

M. Renouvier, as Dr. Janssens very clearly points out, while the reviver, is, from his own point of view, the reformer of Kantism, he departs from the master in the endeavor to construct a more logically consistent system. He reconciles Hume with Kant, completing and correcting one by the other. He introduces the Kantian forms or categories into Hume's psychology and eliminates by means of the latter's empiricism *le mauvais germe de la metaphysique substantialiste* of which the German thinker could not wholly purge his system (p. 21).

The critics of Kant's criticism are wont to emphasize his inconsistency in tearing down with speculative what he builds up with practical reason, the two faculties being in reality, nevertheless, one. But the essential inconsistency is found by Renouvier, as Dr. Janssens shows, to lie deeper, in the very heart of the *Critique of Pure Reason*. The radical flaw lies in the admission of the supersensible object at all.

Kant declares that we cannot *know* but that we can *think* the *noumenal*, the thing-in-itself, the unconditioned. Now this distinction and admission he could make only by an inconsistent negation of his primary principles: for we can *think* only by means of the same categories whereby we *know*, and if these are invalid in the latter, they must be invalid in the former operation. Renouvier indicates this inconsequence in Kant's reasoning and pushing the principles a step farther denies the utter *conceivability* of the super-phenomenal, the noumenal. The *existence*, however, of such objects he does not deny, but assigns them to the sphere of *faith*. How faith can accept

what reason is structurally necessitated to ignore, is a problem which we must leave the student of Neo-Criticism to solve for himself.

For the rest, such a student will find valuable aid in Dr. Janssens' work. Renouvier was a voluminous and, like Kant himself, not always a clear writer. The book at hand, though brief, is sufficiently ample to afford the reader a comprehensive grasp of Renouvier's system together with a judicious and well-tempered criticism thereof. Besides this the method and style are perfectly translucent, making the book proportionately to its subject fairly easy reading. The same quality is manifest, it need hardly be said, in Père Vallet's work. The latter, as was suggested above, is concerned mainly with the defence of those fundamental ideas the validity of which is rejected or doubted by Kantism, old and new, and by its offspring agnosticism. It is well to have these bases both of science and faith reëxamined afresh by so experienced an eye as that of the author, and to see for oneself at his suggestion that they remain unmoved, notwithstanding the fierce attack to which they have been subjected from the strongest and most strategic of modern adversaries.

GLENANAAR, A STORY OF IRISH LIFE. By the Very Rev. Canon P. A. Sheehan, D.D., Doneraile. New York: Longmans, Green, & Co. (Dolphin Press.)

In the current issue of THE DOLPHIN we publish the last chapter of Father Sheehan's story, *Glenanaar*, and simultaneously the whole appears in book form. The fact that the novel comes from the pen of the author of *My New Curate* might be a sufficient guarantee of excellence, for the story deals altogether with a subject in the handling of which our author has, as is universally conceded, shown marked superiority over former Irish writers even of the modern classic period. As there have been critics of *My New Curate* and *Luke Delmege*, so there will perhaps be also critics of *Glenanaar*. But the instances in which Canon Sheehan's former works were underestimated by those who found a way for their critique into some popular magazine or paper, bore with them the credentials of a bias which is apt to discredit itself in other ways quite as markedly.

Since our readers, either of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW or of THE DOLPHIN (its sister magazine for the laity interested in really good literature), were the first in every instance to have the benefit of Father Sheehan's publications placed before them, we need hardly do more than commend this story in its present form. Like *My New Curate*,

Luke Delmege, *Under the Cedars and the Stars*, all of which we published at first-hand, *Glenanaar* has a distinctly literary value quite apart from the intensely interesting pictures of domestic and national life which its descriptions of Irish scenes afford. Its historical background, its splendid delineation of such actual characters as Daniel O'Connell, in the midst of his people, and not simply as the stereotyped hero of the aspirations of Irish independence, give to this book an interest much superior to the exquisite romances of William Carleton or others of equal power. There is also interwoven with the passionate sincerity of an Irish maiden and her lover's manly simplicity, the sentiment of a mingled patriotism. The central figure is a youth who with all the noble instincts of his native heath takes on, during a sojourn of many years in America, a coating of that Yankee sense which somehow does not well amalgamate with Celtic temperament and Irish manners. But the feature is novel and adds attraction to the situation, if only by the contrast which serves at the same time to create a convenient motive for what constitutes the most powerful action in the dramatic compostion of the whole. There are other characters with which one falls in love at very first sight. Charles Dickens never drew a portrait of a child more sweetly true than Father Sheehan's little Nodlag.

But we must let you read it who have not seen THE DOLPHIN during the past year. Let us send you the book, which is better than any outline we can give of it.

Amoenitates Pastorales.

Father Michael was a kindly master, as was well known in the whole town. Recently he engaged a new hostler, a happy-go-lucky fellow who had a genius for invention but was withal an industrious, trustworthy fellow. A few weeks ago, Pat asked for a "day off."

"Me granmother's dead, sor, and begorra I'd like to go to the funeral," said Pat.

He was granted the leave of absence. Ten days afterwards Pat asked for another day.

"What's the matter now?" asked the priest.

"Matther it is, sor?" replied Pat. "Shure an' me grandmother's dead, the saints rest her soul."

"Why, that's what you said before."

"Shure I did that, sor, but that were my mother's mother, and this time it is me father's mother."

He got that day, but when the next week Pat asked for another day, his master was perplexed.

"More grandmothers dead?" he asked.

"Yes, your reverence, there be. It's me father's mother, sor, and she do be going to be buried to-morrer."

"Ah, Pat," said the priest," "I have you there. Your father's mother died before, you know."

"So she did, sor; so she did. But me mother wor married twice, sor."

The Rev. Dr. Nextly, in pursuance of a design to deliver a series of discourses on the mountains of the Bible, made the following announcement:

"Next Sunday evening, brethren, I shall preach a sermon on Mount Ararat."

And after the services were over Aunt Ann Peebles went forward to say goodby and wish him a pleasant voyage and safe return.

An elderly lady travelling in Ireland uttered an exclamation of horror at the sight of some very small boys bathing in the river well in view of the road. "It's too scandalous," she exclaimed. "Where are the police?" "What is it, Ma'am?" said the priest. The irate lady replied by pointing in the direction of the river. "Is it those gossoons over there you're studying? For my part, I'm not in the habit of reading small print at that distance."

An amusing story is told of the present Archbishop of Canterbury. Dr. Temple was often greeted by perfectly unknown young men who professed to be old friends, and who afterwards turned out to be old Rugby boys. The Bishop got into the way of pretending to remember the identity of any lively person who flew up to him with rapturous greetings—simply to save lengthy, and sometimes crestfallen, explanations. One day, at Oxford, a handsome youth greeted him with a fervent shake of the hand. "Eh?" said the always curt Bishop, abstractedly. "You quite well?" "Yes," replied the good-looking young man, with graciousness. "All well at home?" said the Bishop. The young man stared slightly, but replied, courteously: "All well, thank you." "Father well?" said the Bishop. "My

father, sir, is dead," said the young man, with a little pardonable sternness. "Ah!" said the utterly undisturbed Bishop, "and how's mother?" "Sir," replied the handsome young man, with great gravity, "Her Majesty the Queen is in excellent health." He was Prince Leopold, the Duke of Albany, to whom Dr. Temple had been tutor, but whom that unimpressionable Bishop had for the time being forgotten. The reply is unrecorded!

An enthusiastic professor of Roman history had been advocating the advantages of athletic exercise. "The Roman youth," he cried, "used to swim three times across the Tiber before breakfast."

A Scotch student in the class smiled, at which the irate professor exclaimed, "Mr. McAllister, why do you smile? We shall be glad to share your amusement."

The canny Scot replied: "I was just thinking, sir, that the Roman youths must have left their coats on the wrong bank at the end of their swim."

"I come mighty nigh swearin'," the deacon confessed, as he came into the house, nursing a bruised thumb.

"You don't tell me!" said his wife.

"But I do tell you. I am a-tellin' you right now. I hit my thumb with the hammer, and 'sted of sayin' 'By ginger!' like I 'most always do, I hollers out, 'By pepper!'" I dunno how much hotter I would 'a' made it if it had hurt a little worse."

"I was about two months in camp," relates Dr. Arthur O'Neill, lately returned from Manila, "when a soldier brought me a card with the information that a Spanish officer had given it to him, and wished to see me. Glancing over the white cardboard I perceived that the name was the same as my own. In clear type I beheld Arturo O'Neill."

"Having ordered the soldier to conduct the visitor to my apartment, a tall, handsome young gentleman soon made his appearance. No sooner had I greeted him than he said:

"I saw your name in one of the morning papers, and immediately felt a natural impulse to have an interview with you. We have sprung, I presume, from the same old Irish stock. My ancestors were the O'Neills of Ulster. They left Ireland at the close of the sixteenth century. Since that time my family has been rooted in Spain; but

the history and traditions of our Irish ancestry have been transmitted to us and preserved as a most precious heirloom."

"Needless to say," continued Dr. O'Neill, "that I was delighted to meet, in the distant Philippines, a descendant of the Ulster chief who outmatched and defeated the greatest generals of Queen Elizabeth's time. The young Spanish officer was proud of his name and race, and I was proud of him, I tell you."

Another incident also related by the doctor will be of interest to our readers:

"While off duty one day, in Manila, Dr. A. P. O'Brien and myself paid a visit to the Jesuit church. Being educated by the learned priests of that order, in California, we felt after our visit to the church that we ought to pay our respects to the reverend professors at the college. In the very best Spanish we had, we asked the brother acting as porter if any of the priests of the college spoke English.

"In English every bit as good as our Spanish he answered affirmatively. Then showing us to a room, he went and brought us a venerable-looking gentleman, who greeted us most cordially in our own tongue:

"'It is many a year,' said the old Jesuit, 'since I had occasion to converse in the language of my youth. What are your names, gentlemen?'

"We gave him our names—O'Brien and O'Neill."

"'Irish! Irish!' he exclaimed, 'and I am Irish, too. My name is Doyle, and I hail from County Wicklow, Ireland.'

"On meeting Father Doyle, we felt a new interest in the Philippines. With him we spent a pleasant afternoon and returned many a time thereafter. Father Doyle is now a general favorite with the volunteers serving in Manila."

Books Received.

THEOLOGICAL AND ASCETICAL.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIAE MORALIS. Beatae Mariae Virgini Dicatum. Auctore Fr. Josepho Calasanctio Card. Vives, O.M.Cap. Editio VIII. Romae, Ratisbonae, Neo-Eboraci: Fridericus Pustet. 1904. Pp. 670. Price, $1.50 *n. t.*

DIE KANONESSAMMLUNG DES KARDINALS DEUSDEDIT. I. Band: Die Kanonessammlung Selbst. Mit Unterstützung der Savigny-Kommission der Kaiserlichen

Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Neu herausgegeben von Dr. Victor Wolf Von Glanvell, Professor der Rechte an der Universität Gratz. Mit drei Lichtdrucktafeln. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh. 1905. Pp. liv—656.

THE CRUX OF PASTORAL MEDICINE. The Perils of Embryonic Man: Abortion, Craniotomy, and the Cæsarean Section; Myoma, and the Porro Section. By Rev. Andrew Klarmann. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. 1905. Pp. 162.

IN THE MATTER OF REMARRIAGE AFTER DIVORCE. Bishop Doane vs. the Catholic Church. The Bishop's Argument Explained. By John T. Creagh. Boston: John T. Creagh. 1905. Pp. 53.

SYNOPSIS THEOLOGIAE MORALIS ET PASTORALIS. Ad mentem S. Thomae et S. Alphonsi, Hodiernis Moribus Accommodata. Tomus Secundus: "Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis." Auctore Ad. Tanquerey. Tornaci (Belg.), Insulis (Lille): Desclée, Lefebvre et Soc.; Parisiis: Letouzey et Ané. 1905. Pp. 339.

L'ÉVANGÉLIAIRE DES DIMANCHES, commenté et illustré de 130 gravures par l'abbé C. Broussolle, premier aumônier du Lycée Michelet, à Paris. Paris, 22, rue Cassette: P. Lethielleux. 1905. Pp. xvi—418. Prix, 4 francs.

CATHOLIC IDEALS IN SOCIAL LIFE. By Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C., Westminster: Art and Book Company. 1905. Pp. 249.

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF THE MOTHER OF GOD. An Exposition by Archbishop Ullathorne, O.S.B. Revised by Canon Iles, D.D. With a Prefatory Letter by the Bishop of Birmingham. Westminster: Art and Book Company. 1905. Pp. 224.

DAUGHTERS OF THE FAITH. Serious Thoughts for Catholic Women (Manual). By Eliza O'B. Lummis. New York: The Knickerbocker Press. 1905. Pp. xxxiii—159.

PASTORAL LETTER ON THE TEACHING OF THE CATECHISM. By the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Fall River, Mass. Pp. 7.

TALKS WITH PARENTS. By the Rev. D. V. Phalen, Halifax, N.S.: McAlpine Publishing Co., Ltd. 1905. Pp. 78.

ALLEL. A Pentecostal Sequence from *Wreaths of Song through a Course of Divinity*. By the Rev. T. J. O'Mahony, D.D., D.C.L., All Hallows' College. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd. 1905. Pp. 24.

THE CHRISTIAN MAIDEN. Translated from the German of the Rev. Matthias von Bremscheid, O.M.Cap. by the Members of the Young Ladies' Sodality, Holy Trinity Church, Boston. With additional Prayers. With Preface by the Right Rev. William Stang, D.D., Bishop of Fall River, Mass. Boston: Angel Guardian Press. 1905. Pp. 118. Price, $0.50.

LITURGICAL.

PLAIN CHANT AND SOLESMES. By Dom Paul Cagin, O.S.B., Librarian of Solesmes, and Dom André Mocquereau, O.S.B., Prior of Solesmes. London: Burns & Oates, Ltd.; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. Pp. 70. Price, 0.45, *net*.

COMPENDIUM SACRAE LITURGIAE JUXTA RITUUM ROMANUM. Una cum Appendice de jure ecclesiastico particulari in America Foederata Sept. Vigente. Scripsit P. Innocentius Wapelhorst, O.F.M., S. Theol. Lector, olim Rector Sem. Salesiani et S. Litur. Professor. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1905. Pp. xvi—601—9.